

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'A BIBLE has immense advantages for those who can use it, but for the world at large it has its dangers.'

The sentence occurs in *The Greek Genius and its Meaning to us*, a book written by Mr. R. W. LIVINGSTONE, Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and published at the Clarendon Press (6s. net). At the moment Mr. LIVINGSTONE is dealing with freedom of speech, which he recognizes as one of the elements of the Greek genius. The Greeks, he tells us, enjoyed freedom of speech beyond all other nations that have ever appeared upon the earth. And one of the reasons why they had such a unique enjoyment of freedom of speech was that they possessed no Bible. For 'a Bible has immense advantages for those who can use it, but for the world at large it has its dangers.'

Why should the Bible restrain freedom of speech? Mr. LIVINGSTONE does not tell us why it should do so; he tells us only that it does so. He answers our question by a historical example. It is the old and familiar example of Galileo. Mr. LIVINGSTONE tells the story over again in this way: 'The Psalmist had said that the sun "runneth about from one end of heaven to the other," and that "the foundations of the round world are so firmly fixed that they cannot be

moved.'" How then could Galileo maintain that the earth moves about the sun?' Thus the Bible restrained Galileo's freedom of speech.

It was a mistaken use to make of the Bible. We admit it. We have admitted it for a long time. And if a single example can prove a proposition, then for the world at large the Bible has its dangers. And so the question comes to be this: Is it better to have no Bible at all than to have a Bible which may be used to restrain our freedom of speech?

If we have no Bible, what then? Then, says Mr. LIVINGSTONE, we have no God. That is to say, we have no God worth calling God; we have no God that we can worship. It was his Bible, he says, that gave the Jew his God. The Greek, having no Bible, 'thought his gods out.' And even Mr. LIVINGSTONE, with all his affection for the Greeks, and with all his aversion to the Jews, admits that no man can truly worship a god whom he himself has thought out.

Well, the day is at hand when it will become necessary for every one of us to make up our minds whether, to use Mr. LIVINGSTONE's language, we are to be Jews with a Bible or Greeks without one. The Greek takes a purely human attitude towards life. He assumes that man is the measure

of all things, and believes that even though the unseen may be there, still we can know our duty and live our life without reference to it. Are we to become humanists like the Greeks? 'That,' says Mr. LIVINGSTONE, 'is perhaps the biggest question of the day, the one most worth settling, the one which every man has to settle for himself.'

Now, if our minds are made up and we are to be humanists, we ought to understand that we are not making an experiment. We are humanists with our eyes open, with an understanding of what humanism can do for us. For the Greeks tried it before us, and they tried it with a whole-heartedness which can never again be surpassed in the history of the world. The Greeks lived their life in the present; they did not trouble themselves about the future. They lived among things seen; they did not concern themselves with the unseen. They said literally, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' How did they find it work?

They found it worked comparatively well while things went well with them and while they were young. The Greeks enjoyed their youth. But they did not look forward with pleasure to old age. If we may judge from Greek literature, humanists approach old age lamenting the loss of youth's capacity for action and enjoyment. When age comes they say that they

... feel her slowly chilling breath invade
 The cheek grown thin, the brown hair sprent
 with grey;
 They feel her finger light
 Laid pausefully upon life's headlong train;—
 The foot less prompt to meet the morning dew,
 The heart less bounding at emotion new,
 And hope, once crush'd, less quick to spring
 again.

Nor does humanism serve better when sorrow comes. At the end of the first year of the Peloponnesian War there was a public funeral for those who had fallen, and all Athens was there to

hear Pericles give the address over their graves. Before him in the crowd he could see those whose husbands, fathers, sons had fallen. What has he to say to them? What comfort can he bring? This is what he said: 'You know that your life has been passed among manifold vicissitudes; and that they may be thought fortunate who have gained most honour, whether an honourable death like your sons, or an honourable sorrow like yours. I know how hard it is to make you feel this, when the good fortune of others will too often remind you of the gladness which once lightened your hearts. The deepest sorrow is felt at the loss of blessings to which we have grown accustomed. Some of you are of an age at which they may hope to have other children, and they ought to bear their sorrow better. Not only will the children who may be born hereafter make them forget their own lost ones, but the city will be a gainer. To those of you who have passed their prime, I say: "Congratulate yourselves that you have been happy during the greater part of your days; remember that your life of sorrow will not last long, and be comforted by the glory of those who are gone. Honour is the delight of men when they are old and useless."''

Neither in the prospect of old age nor in the presence of death does it do well to ignore the unseen and the eternal. How does it work in youth and manhood? How does it work in health and prosperity? Turn to the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and you will find the answer. It is a chapter we have difficulty in reading now; yet no one who knows Greek or Roman literature calls it exaggerated. And what is the source of that immeasurable sewer of iniquity? The Greeks and Romans were without God and without hope in the world. And Mr. LIVINGSTONE tells us that they were without God and without hope *because they were without a Bible*.

Some account has already been given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of Messrs. Williams &

Norgate's 'Home University Library,' the first forty volumes having been noticed in one short comprehensive article. Other ten volumes have now been published. One of them has the title of *Conservatism*. Its author is Lord Hugh CECIL, M.A., M.P. That volume should have appeared earlier, for it is No. 11 in the list. But we know that Lord Hugh CECIL has of late had much to do. The publishers were no doubt glad to receive it at any time. Readers of it will be as glad as the publishers. But before we say anything about what this volume contains, let us discharge our duty and name the authors and subjects of the other nine books of the list.

Two of them are religious—*Nonconformity*, by Principal W. B. SELBIE, and *Buddhism*, by Mrs. Rhys DAVIDS. Two belong to language and literature—*Medieval English Literature*, by Professor W. P. KER, and *The English Language*, by Mr. L. Pearsall SMITH. One is historical—*The American Civil War*, by Mr. Frederic L. PAXSON, Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin. Finally, four are scientific. There is a volume on *Psychology*, by that master of sane English psychology, Mr. W. McDougall, Reader in Mental Philosophy in the University of Oxford. There is also a volume on *The Principles of Physiology*, by Emeritus-Professor McKENDRICK of Glasgow; there is a volume on *Matter and Energy*, by Mr. Frederick SODDY of the same University; and there is a volume on *Agriculture*, by Dr. William SOMERVILLE, Sibthorpe Professor of Rural Economy in Oxford.

These names and titles are surely attractive enough. But if not, the publishers are prepared to make them irresistible. For they offer two prizes, a first prize of twenty-five pounds and a second prize of five pounds, for the best short essay on any one or all of the ten volumes, the chief conditions being that the competitor shall be not more than twenty-five years of age on September 1, 1912, and that no essay shall exceed 2000 words. And now to Lord Hugh CECIL and *Conservatism*.

Lord Hugh CECIL has divided his book into two parts. Of the second part the first chapter is entitled 'Religion and Politics.' Let us turn to that chapter.

It begins with a demand for principles. Lord Hugh CECIL has much to say about principles. Instead of *Conservatism*, his book might have been called *Conservative Principles*. And he uses the word advisedly. He does not bluntly say that a politician of no principles is a politician of no principle. For he is in his study, writing calmly and courteously. But he does not hide it from us that that is his meaning. Men of Conservative principles, he says, have a standard of right and wrong to which they refer their conduct. Of men who have no such standard he would say, as emphatically as Lorenzo said of the unmusical, 'Let no such man be trusted.'

If, then, the politician must have a definite ethical standard, what is that standard? 'It needs little argument,' says Lord Hugh CECIL, 'to show that it must be that of Christian morals as revealed in the New Testament'; and he adds, 'This always has been and still is the position of all the different elements of which the modern Conservative Party is made up, and, indeed, of the vast majority of the people, to whatever political party they belong.' It is a memorable saying. What will the unbeliever make of it? If Christ is a mere man, if there is even some doubt of His earthly existence, how are we to account for the fact that twenty centuries of the history of the world have taken not one step in advance of the ethical principles which He inculcated? Here in the twentieth century is a politician—a politician, mind you, in search of a background against which to set his conduct in order that he may look at it clearly and judge it fairly—and he tells us that he can find no background comparable in elevation and integrity with the standard of righteousness contained in the Gospels.

Lord Hugh CECIL is quite well aware that there

are politicians who do not adopt that standard. 'It is true,' he says, 'that in our time there is a disposition, not very definitely formulated but increasingly powerful, to claim a right to go behind the authority of the New Testament in morals, and to supersede it in favour of some other undefined standard.' 'But,' he says, and his words are well worth attending to, 'this tendency is not yet sufficiently strong to make it needful or useful to consider it at length in this place.'

And it makes the situation not less but more surprising when we are told that the direct teaching of the New Testament on matters of State 'is slight and even meagre.' The teaching of the New Testament is occupied with principles of conduct; it does not condescend to details. Why does it not condescend? Because that would have arrested its influence as a standard of authority within the first generation or two; and so the wonder is, How did Jesus, if He was a man, and only a man, know that that rock was there? Muhammad did not know. Muhammad never dreamt of its existence, and shattered his vessel upon it.

What has the New Testament to say about matters of State? Only three things, says Lord Hugh CECIL. First, the duty of obedience to the State is enforced. Next, the separation of things spiritual and things material is taught in the memorable 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' Lastly, 'the example of patient submission even to oppression is prominent throughout.' Lord Hugh CECIL sums up the teaching of the New Testament on political matters in this statement; 'Obedience is due to the authority of the State within its own sphere, but that sphere does not extend to purely spiritual matters.'

Now that statement runs out in two directions. It runs out in the direction of what is known in Scotland as 'the Headship of Christ'; and it runs

out in the direction of what is known in England as 'the Divine Right of kings.'

First, as to the Headship of Christ. It need not be said that Lord Hugh CECIL believes in an established Church. He believes in the establishment of the Church in England, and he believes in the establishment of the Church in Scotland. For he believes in 'the national affirmation of the existence of God and the moral responsibility to His judgment which attaches to men in their national, no less than in their individual acts'; and he does not see how that 'national affirmation' can exist apart from establishment. It must be confessed, however, that he does not make it quite clear what he means by establishment. It has nothing to do with endowment. For he discusses disestablishment and disendowment separately. What then, apart from endowment, is establishment? He says that establishment is necessary to the national recognition of religion, but he does not say in what ways, apart from endowment, religion may be nationally recognized.

On the Divine Right of kings Lord Hugh CECIL has less to say, and he says it more effectively. He has no doubt whatever that tyranny justifies resistance; it is recognized, he says, on all hands. And he claims for himself the right, as he concedes the right to every other person, to say what tyranny is. 'Within very recent years two important cases of actual resistance to the law have arisen, and a third still more important may arise in the near future. Nonconformists have refused payment of the education rate on the ground that it is inconsistent with their convictions to pay it; advocates of Women's Suffrage have riotously approached Parliament, have assaulted the police and used other acts of violence in order to bring home to public opinion the reality of their claim for votes for women; and the inhabitants of Belfast and the surrounding districts who are opposed to Home Rule have announced that in all the circumstances of the case they cannot consent to be placed under the government of

a National Parliament in Ireland, and that they are prepared for a temporary separation rather than consent to such submission.'

Lord Hugh CECIL has nothing with which to reproach the Nonconformists who refuse payment of the education rate. He has no fault to find with the advocates of Women's Suffrage who approached Parliament even although they did it riotously and assaulted the police. And it is evident that he thinks the inhabitants of Belfast will be within their right should they take measures for a temporary separation rather than submit to a Nationalist Parliament in Ireland. 'Cases of resistance,' he says, 'are likely to become more and more common. Nor are Conservatives better guides in this perplexity than Radicals. The most that can be said is that, on the whole, Conservatives would lean rather more to the side of authority than Radicals, although, as the case of Ireland shows, circumstances might arise strong enough to produce a reversal in the attitude of the two parties.'

Is the Old Testament worth presenting to the young? That question stood as the title of one of the papers read at a conference which was held in Cambridge in April 1912. The papers read at the Conference, edited by the Rev. N. P. WOOD, M.A., B.D., have been gathered into a thin volume and published at the Cambridge Press under the general title of *Scripture Teaching in Secondary Schools* (1s. 6d. net). It is the Rev. F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D., Dean of Jesus College, who asks this question, 'Is the Old Testament worth presenting to the Young?'

Why is such a question asked? It is asked because of the difficulties that lie in the way of presenting the Old Testament to the young. There are four kinds of difficulties. They may be called moral, scientific, critical, and historical.

Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON puts the moral difficulty in this way. He says that even in its highest

aspect the morality inculcated in the Old Testament generally needs some qualification; almost every precept requires the 'But I say unto you' of Christ. Is it expedient, then, to begin with the Old Testament in giving instruction to the young? Is it expedient to include it in their curriculum at all?

The scientific difficulty is more evident. It begins with the first chapter of the first book of the Old Testament; and it is at least as serious there as it is anywhere else. Have we not, says Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON, to teach one thing in the geography lesson and another when we turn to the Book of Genesis? Is not most of the Old Testament built on absolutely false suppositions in regard to every discovery in science since the close of the Middle Ages? And the question is, Are we justified in troubling young people with early beliefs and guesses about the universe now demonstrably false?

The third difficulty is concerned with criticism. To the average conscientious teacher it is the greatest difficulty of all, and the most pressing. He believes it is the origin of all the rest of the difficulties. How easy it was once to teach such stories as Jacob's flight, Joseph and his brethren, or the Exodus, when you made a straightforward narrative out of your Bible. How difficult it is to teach these stories now. 'We are taught,' says Dean FOAKES-JACKSON, 'that there are three main stories of Jacob, each subdivided into contributions by different hands. How am I to explain that this patchwork narrative of one who is in one place a tribe and in another a tribal God, and only occasionally an individual, has a history worth any attention from a seeker after moral truth? It was easy formerly to see in Joseph an example of probity and virtue, of love of home and magnanimity, and to tell children how he, the favourite, was sold as a slave, and by his honesty and wisdom rose to be the chief man in Egypt, and the saviour of his brethren. But how are we to deal with him if Joseph is only a Rachel tribe, the story of his

temptation a popular Egyptian narrative, and his reconciliation to his brethren a treaty related in poetic form? Even if we do tell the story as it appears in Genesis, are we justified in ignoring J, E, and P, and all their manifold combinations? And as frankness would only end in boring and mystifying the children—surely it is better not to trouble them at all?’

The last difficulty is historical. A large part of the Old Testament is historical. Let us leave the early narratives of Genesis alone, says the distracted teacher, and let us teach the history that is in the historical books. But is it history? Are not the facts frequently subordinated to purposes of edification? Have the Old Testament historians any real conception of what we mean by history? The historians of the Old Testament are as often poets or prophets as they are historians. And the more prophetic they are, and even the more poetical, the more are they satisfied that they are fulfilling the purposes of true history. ‘To tell a boy that the historical books of the Old Testament contain a record which satisfies our ideas of history is to put him off the track altogether.’

Is the Old Testament worth presenting to the young, then? Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON believes that it is well worth. He believes that it is the more worth for the very reason that these difficulties are in the way.

For in the first place he holds it to be undeniable that the purpose of the Old Testament is throughout moral. It teaches morality, and it teaches it deliberately. In Greek or Roman history when we hear of a great man perishing miserably we are simply pained; but the fate of Saul moves us to indignation because we consider he did not deserve it. This difference of feeling is due to the fact that in dealing with the history of other nations we are satisfied with events; when we turn to the history of Israel we look for their moral interpretation. It may be quite true that the morality of the Old Testament is elementary. Dr. FOAKES-

JACKSON holds that it is the better suited to the young. Moral consciousness among men is a matter of development. Let boys begin with the morality of the Old Testament and they will come in time to appreciate and practise the morality of the New.

With the second difficulty, the antagonism between the Old Testament and elementary truths in science and geography, Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON is not greatly concerned. It is a difficulty that was formidable forty years ago; it is not formidable now. There was a time when it was supposed that the first chapter of Genesis must be confirmed by modern geology, or one or the other must go. That does not seem now to be felt, either by the scientist or the defender of Christianity. And all that the teacher has now to do is plainly to tell the class that the ancient Hebrews did not and could not possibly know what a later age has discovered, and that their ignorance on these points does not detract from the value of what they have to teach us on others.

But when he comes to criticism he comes to a subject of real difficulty. He seems to think, however, that much of the difficulty is due to the average teacher's ignorance of what criticism is, and what is the difference it has made to the teaching of the Old Testament. So he begins by telling us what are the general results of Old Testament criticism. He sets them down in the following six short statements:—

1. The Old Testament is a collection of documents of different periods put together in their present form at a comparatively late date, say, between B.C. 500 and 160.
2. What we call the Law of Moses contains the chief ritual, dietary and ceremonial Laws, together with the arrangements for the worship of Jehovah from the latest collection of Laws.
3. There is a primitive history, if not histories, of Israel, and a later one coloured by the presupposition that the priestly law was in force from an early time.

4. The most valuable contemporary evidence we have is to be found in the utterances of the prophets.

5. We are not on anything approaching solid ground till we reach the ninth century B.C., when Israel is brought into contact with Assyria; and before (say) David, we have to rely mainly on tradition for information about Israel.

6. The religion of Israel before the appearance of the literary prophets approximated more to that of the kindred nations than was generally supposed.

Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON does not claim that all these things are proved. He claims only that they are 'fairly generally' accepted. On the assumption that they are true he proceeds to discuss how the Old Testament may be presented to the young. Now he has no sympathy with the teacher, or, we suppose, with the preacher, who boasts that on all occasions and under all circumstances he is prepared to tell the whole truth, though he certainly has no sympathy with the other type of teacher who is prepared to tell what he believes not to be true. He holds that it is a mistake for any teacher of the young, and, for that matter, of the old as well as the young, in teaching what he calls the whole truth, to blurt out views and theories which lead to a completely mistaken view of the matter.

Suppose he has to teach the Book of Genesis. He finds certain things in it which he cannot teach literally as facts. Again, he finds statements about the miraculous which he has difficulty in accepting. And in the third place he has to face certain critical views and theories. As regards the facts, he believes that he must be perfectly frank, especially when they conflict with scientific or historical truth. In respect to the miracles more caution is necessary. Yet the miracles of the Old Testament are less difficult than those of the New, and less depends upon them. Still he holds that the utmost caution is necessary in order that the teacher may avoid such pitfalls as the vague

assertion that miracles do not happen. Whether miracles happen or not is a philosophical, not a scientific question, and science must never be confounded with philosophy.

But the real difficulty is again with the critical theories. His method is to trouble none but the very best students with problems concerning sources. Nor does he think it desirable to say much even to them on these topics until they are in fair possession of the main facts of the Biblical story, and have also learned how to use them for their profit. 'For,' he says, 'the Bible is not merely a literary puzzle. If it were that, it would have been dropped long ago. It is God's message to His people, and when it ceases to be that, it is of little value to any one.'

And so Dean FOAKES-JACKSON comes to the last of all the difficulties which the teacher of the Old Testament has to deal with. Is the Old Testament history, or is it not? He believes that it is very much nearer true history than we are now in the habit of thinking. He takes the references in the Old Testament to warfare. He points out that not in a single instance does an Israelite judge or king use horses before the days of Solomon. The enemies of Israel have chariots and horsemen, but Israel never. The Canaanites from the earliest times have chariots of iron. The Philistines on Mount Gilboa press Saul hard with their chariots and horsemen. Yet not even David with all his prowess is said to have possessed cavalry. Never to have fallen into inconsistency on such a point as this is evidence to Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON that the Old Testament writers have claim to be considered historians.

In conclusion—but let us quote his words: 'In conclusion,' he says, 'I would make an earnest plea for the retention of the study of the Old Testament. We may feel the difficulties of teaching it keenly: but we hardly realise what we should lose by abandoning it. We should give up an appeal to the interest of the young which we could ill afford

to lose; for the stories of the Old Testament stir the imagination as nothing else in the world can do. We should give up that connexion with the ideas and feelings of the East which have so much to contribute to the right understanding of

the Christian faith. Above all, we should surrender the very key to the revelation of the New Testament, which was, and is, and always must be based upon the right understanding of the books of the Old Testament.'

The Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul.

BY THE REV. C. ANDERSON SCOTT, M.A., D.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT
EXEGESIS, WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

AN examination of the dualistic element in the thinking of St. Paul seems to be called for, in view of the double fact that it has very important bearing on the exegesis of several passages in the Epistles as well as on the theology of the Apostle in general, and that at the same time it has received quite inadequate recognition and treatment. The most cursory examination of the current handbooks and treatises on Paul and the Pauline theology will show how little place and weight are given to this element in his thought. And if some are prepared to say that it is overlooked because it is not there, they have good authority for their opinion. It will suffice to turn to the index to Professor H. A. A. Kennedy's valuable work on *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, where we find this entry: 'Dualism, no trace of, in Paul.' In the text to which the index refers we find something not quite so sweeping: (p. 146) 'We see nothing in his writings to justify the hypothesis so frequently charged upon him, that he took a dualistic view of human nature'; (p. 329) 'It is altogether groundless to rear on this foundation the theory of a cosmic dualism in St. Paul.' With both of these statements we may heartily agree, and yet demur strongly to the opinion that there is 'no trace of dualism in St. Paul.'

For, quite apart from a 'cosmic dualism' or a 'dualistic view of human nature,' there is a dualism which consists in the recognition, whether in theory or practice, of a power or powers other than God, external to man, exerting influence over human affairs, and in some sense or degree independent of God. This definition is purposely made very wide: for there are many forms or grades of this dualism, each affecting a man's

thinking in a different way. We have to ascertain what traces there may be of dualism of any kind, and to estimate its character and its influence on the thinking of St. Paul.

Before examining the evidence of the Apostle's own letters, it will be well to mark the antecedent probability that he held a dualistic view of life; in other words, that there were certain sides of life, certain experiences which he interpreted by referring them to the action and influence of powers which were in some sense independent of, and even hostile to, God. The probability is very strong. Indeed, if Paul did not hold some such view, he would be at variance with the universal opinion of his time. For dualism was one of the three new factors which make their appearance in the later stage of the Old Testament history, and specially after the exile, Individualism, Dualism, and Pessimism. These three are closely connected, and together go far to account for the too long unrecognized gulf between 'Hebrew' and 'Jewish' thought.

The optimism regarding the future, which was the essence of the Messianic hope in all its forms, was simply the counterpart of a pessimism regarding the present which laid increasing hold on the Jewish mind. And this pessimism partly grew out of, and partly fostered, a dualistic view of things. But that view was religious, not philosophic, in its origin. The very intensity of men's belief in God led them, when faced by the hopeless situation of His people, to postulate a source for their present experience other than God. Because they despaired of the world that now is, they looked with increasing wistfulness for a world or age to come, a new heaven and a new earth. And they found a justification for their despair, as well as an

explanation of their experience, in the view that the present world or age had fallen under the dominion of an evil power. In the later canonical and the inter-canonical literature the pictures and predictions due to the old prophets are reproduced indeed, but on a new plane. The old world and the old nation are no longer regarded as furnishing a sphere for the Divine redemption. The contrast between present and future in this world undergoes the supremely significant change into a contrast between this world or age and the world or age to come. And all hope is projected beyond a crisis of Divine interference. The situation is well summarized by Hollmann: 'If we compare the apocalyptic with the older Jewish views, even those of the earliest post-exilic period, the most important difference that confronts us is the dualism of the Apocalyptic theory of the world. It is the most decisive characteristic of this class of literature, a new trait foreign to Judaism. The present world is bad, the prey of Satan and the demons, given over to irremediable destruction. . . . No doubt there always existed in the Jewish religion, as in all popular religions and even in the prophetic period, a belief in evil, uncanny spectres, and goblins. What is new in the apocalyptic is the remarkable prominence of this belief, and the consolidation of all these beings to a kingdom of evil under a monarchical government.'¹ And, in fact, the Messiah of Apocalyptic literature, so far as he appears at all, is really a dualistic figure. His appearance is called for by the fact that the world *κεῖται ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ*: he is the vice-gerent of God, sent to give battle not to earthly tyrants, but to Satan and the spiritual hosts of evil.

It is, of course, impossible to say that the point of view found in this Apocalyptic literature was characteristic of all sections of the Jewish people, e.g. in the time of Paul. The Sadducees doubtless, who denied the existence of angels or spirits, would necessarily be excluded from it. But there can be no doubt that for the bulk of the people it formed the background of religion; and the probability is great that it would colour the earliest impressions on the mind of Saul of Tarsus.

This *a priori* probability might be challenged from two sides. It might be argued, as it is

probably taken for granted by many, that St. Paul, when he became a Christian, started with a *tabula rasa* for a mind: that though this might be the view of the world held by him before his conversion, that has no bearing on the question of his subsequent opinions. But such a position becomes untenable in the light of any thorough research. The evidence is too copious and too strong which points to the persistence after his conversion alike of conceptions and of habits of thought which belonged to his Jewish atmosphere and upbringing. We see in the Epistles the utterance of living thought in which both old and new elements of consciousness are intermingled, the new sometimes overcoming and excluding the old, sometimes coalescing with it; and the fascinating task of the student is to apply a kind of qualitative analysis, to discover what elements are present in their traditional form, what others are wholly new, and what others again have been 'altered' by the irruptive forces of Christian experience.

It might be argued, more plausibly perhaps, that the Apocalyptic literature from which we derive much evidence and many details of this dualistic conception belongs to, and represents, only a section of Jewish society, and that possibly Paul belonged to another section and was unaffected by it. It is true that the strictly legal Rabbinic schools rejected the Apocalypses; but that was not till after A.D. 70. And the fact that formal repudiation was necessary may be said to point to a period when they had been widely accepted. 'It is incorrect,' says Hollmann, 'to regard the Apocalyptic literature as a sort of heretical backwater of legal Judaism, though Jewish scholars are apt to take this view. In the writings themselves there is no trace of anything of the kind. The volume of this literature and the fact that the Christians simply took over the Apocalypses, and wrote similar works themselves, tells strongly against such a notion.' And as regards belief in a spirit-world among the Pharisees to whom Paul belonged, we have emphatic testimony in the Acts that they believed both in angels and in spirits (23⁸).

There seems, therefore, no sufficient ground to doubt the antecedent probability that Paul shared the prevailing dualistic views of his time, as they are generally represented in the literature which has survived. But such *a priori* considerations

¹ Hollmann, *Jewish Religion in the Time of Christ*, Eng. tr. p. 103ff.; cf. also Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp. 7, 60; and Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 239.

are possibly redundant in view of the clear evidence of his own writings.

In the first place, Paul makes that sharp distinction between the two worlds or ages which is the sign-manual of the Apocalyptic point of view. The wisdom that he speaks is not the wisdom 'of this age,' but the wisdom of God (2 Co 2⁶): he describes the effect of the work of Christ as the deliverance of believers 'out of this present evil age' (Gal 1⁴), and charges them not to be conformed to 'this age' (Ro 12²). When he describes the condition of those who did not know Christ as that of men living under the power of darkness (Col 1¹³), or themselves as 'darkness,' when, on the other hand, he addresses Christians as 'children of light,' he is speaking in terms which have their source in Apocalyptic dualism, such as we find, *e.g.*, in Enoch (41⁸), 'The Lord who made a separation between light and darkness and divided the spirits of men'; (108¹¹) 'The spirits of the good who belong to the generation of light.'

In the second place, he recognizes that of these two ages the one that now is, is in some sense and degree under the dominion of powers hostile alike to God and to man. These are represented sometimes as a host or hierarchy of numerous grades, sometimes as concentrated under or in a single individual. To this individual various names and descriptions are given. Some ten or eleven times Paul refers to this power under the name of 'Satan,' and once as 'Beliar': for descriptive epithets he uses *ὁ πονηρός*, and *ὁ πειράζων*. As to the name 'Satan,' what is important to observe is that St. Paul's Satan is not just the Satan of the Old Testament, even of its latest stratum. Rather does the figure include the conception of the Power of Evil as developed during the inter-canonical period. In his *Introduction to the Book of Job*, Dr. A. B. Davidson gave us what might be called a history of Satan, beginning with the unnamed spirit of 1 K 22¹⁹, and passing through the representation in Job to that in Zechariah. 'In the prophet the Satan appears in somewhat darker colours and in somewhat stronger opposition to the merciful purposes of God in regard to men; hence, while in Job he is merely reproached by God for setting Him on against His servant, he is rebuked in Zechariah. We must be careful not to impose on the Book of Job, or even on this prophet, conceptions which belong to a more

advanced period. The Satan of these books is no mere "evil spirit," the real enemy of God though His unwilling subject. There is no antagonism between God and the Satan. The Satan in Job is the servant of God represented as carrying out His trying, sifting process, and the opposer of men because he is the minister of God.'

It is a very different conception of Satan which meets us in the Pauline Epistles, and indeed in the New Testament in general. He *is* the enemy of God, and exercises other than a merely delegated authority over men. Again, we find the earliest traces of the new conception in the Apocalypses. Under one of many names, such as Mastema, Azazel, or Semjaza, there appears there an independent power of evil, head of a world of evil spirits, the determined foe of God and man. 'In the New Testament period the figure of the Devil is a settled factor of popular belief.' That belief St. Paul shows no signs of repudiating or criticising: yet it is remarkable, as Bousset has pointed out,¹ that his references to Satan under that name are comparatively few, and of these several have a perfunctory sound, that is to say, he seems to use the name in an unreflecting popular way, as, *e.g.*, when he says: 'Satan hindered us,' 'certain have turned aside after Satan.' A greater sense of Satan's reality and independent power seems to underlie the two passages where he claims authority to deliver over an offender to Satan. And yet that one of these two passages which give fullest expression to his thought (1 Co 5⁵) reveals, when closely examined, an unexpected approximation to the Old Testament point of view. Such an one is to be delivered over to Satan unto the destruction of the flesh, in order that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord. The punishment to be inflicted by Satan, however it is to be understood, is disciplinary: it has for its end and purpose the saving of the spirit. So that we have a close parallel to the thought in 1 Co 11³²: *κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν*. Here sickness, disease, and death are the punishments inflicted upon the community which celebrates the Lord's Supper 'unworthily'; but again the purpose is disciplinary, that they may not be condemned together with the world, *i.e.* that they may be saved. The difficulty of the earlier passage is largely met if we recognize that

¹ Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 330.

Paul is there regarding Satan as the agent of the Divine discipline.

But while the ideas underlying the Apostle's use of 'Satan' seem to affiliate rather with the figure of the Old Testament, it is otherwise with that class of passages of which we find the type in 2 Co 4¹: ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτίφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων. The full significance of this phrase must not be minimized, as is done by many commentators, by urging, e.g., that 'Satan is only the God of this world . . . because worldliness makes him its god.' This would still leave open the possibility that for Paul and his contemporaries this power had a very real and objective existence and authority; but it is inconsistent with the direct initiative here ascribed to the God of this world or age. He 'hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving,' and modern commentators, almost without exception, recognize here a dualistic element in the thinking of St. Paul. Volz¹ maintains that the phrase goes in this direction beyond anything that can be produced from Jewish theology, and adds that 'a comparison between Jewish literature and the New Testament on this point shows that the dualism of the New Testament is sharper than that of contemporary Judaism.' If this is so, the explanation may be found partly in the fact that in the New Testament more than elsewhere we are confronted with the ideas of the people rather than the learned, and partly by the reflex influence of a Divine Personality manifested in Jesus: this may well have led to a new emphasis on the person and character of the Power hostile to God.²

The striking phrase in Eph 2², 'the prince of the power (or, powers) of the air,' furnishes a bridge by which we pass from illustrating Paul's conception of evil as concentrated in an individual to his conception of it as distributed among a host or hierarchy of spiritual forces. For the word translated 'power' is a collective noun, and might be rendered 'powers'; and the fact that 'the air' is assigned as their abode gives a clue to their character. Apocalyptic literature throws useful light on the meaning of this phrase. It bears witness to the fact that whereas we think of one 'heaven,' the place of homogeneous experience, the special

dwelling-place of God, and the final home of His people, the view widely held among the Jews of Paul's time was that there were several 'heavens,' of which only the highest was the abode of the Great Glory. The lowest, on the other hand, was occupied by the two hundred rulers of the stars, and the lowest heaven but one by the angels who had apostatized from the Lord.³ Below the lowest heaven was the air, and that, according to a still widespread belief, was the abode of demons and of evil spirits, over which Satan ruled as prince.⁴ The Testament of Levi, again, gives us a catalogue of the seven heavens, and places in the third beings who are described as 'thrones and powers,' while others of the heavens are made the abode of angels of divers kinds and functions.

This conception, so unfamiliar to us, throws light on several important passages in the Epistles. First, let us take the Angels. St. Paul had a poor opinion of angels. That may seem somewhat startling: yet it is true, and to bear it in mind helps to clear some difficulties. The Bible, as a whole, lends little countenance to the conception of angels which plays no inconsiderable part in our popular religion, and is reflected both in our stained-glass windows and in many of our hymns. The Old Testament adheres very closely to the conception of an angel as a messenger from God, without any distinctive ethical character of his own, but deriving his quality of good or bad from the nature of the errand on which he is sent. An 'evil angel' is an emissary of God sent upon an errand of judgment.⁵

But it is not the angels of the Old Testament whom St. Paul has in mind. During the Interval a change of great significance has passed over the prevalent conception regarding such beings. To whatever cause or source this change may be due, its effect was to assign to angels a new independence and initiative, the exercise of power apart from the direct mandate of God, and to many of them a fixed attitude of hostility to God which reacted on the fortunes of men. A further change is seen in the habit of classifying them according to character as good angels or bad, and according

³ So in the *Slavonic Secrets of Enoch*; see esp. Dr. Charles' edition, p. xxxi ff.

⁴ Cf. Test. Benj., τὸ ἀέριον πνεῦμα βέλταρ; and see Eberling, p. 109.

⁵ See A. B. Davidson, in Hastings' *B.D.* i. 96, art. 'Angels.'

¹ Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, p. 81.

² See Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, p. 2, 209 ff.

to rank under such titles as lordships, principalities, powers, or thrones.¹ St. Paul does not press the classification of angels according to character. When he thinks of an angel as belonging to one class or other, he speaks of him either as 'an angel of light' or 'an angel of Satan.' Neither does he show any interest in the question which so fascinated some of the Apocalyptic writers, concerning the 'fallen angels' and the manner of their fall. To put it very briefly, the apostle seems to regard the spirit world as morally very much in the same condition as the world of men; but most of his references are to angels regarded as spiritual forces not on the side of God.

1. If we collect the more significant passages, we find that the intervention of angels even in a good work, reduces its value. This appears to be the idea lying at the back of the sentence in Galatians (2¹⁰) as to the giving of the Law. It was *διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου*, and that marked its inferior or transitory character. St. Paul is comparing the promise given to Abraham with the Law ordained through Moses, with the purpose of showing the sufficiency and superiority of the former. And the Jewish legend of the presence and intervention of angels at Sinai, to which Stephen appeals in Ac 7⁵³ in order to enhance the dignity of the Law, is applied by Paul to illustrate its inferiority. The promise came direct; the Law only mediately, and that by a double mediation, passing first through the hands of the angels, and then through those of Moses. The

¹ E.g., *Slavonic Secrets of Enoch*, xx. 20: 'And these men took me thence and brought me to the seventh heaven, and I saw there a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels and incorporeal powers and lordships and principalities and powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones.'

mediation of angels therefore tended rather to depreciate the Law in comparison with the promise, just as in He 2² it is suggested as depreciating the Law in comparison with the gospel.

2. This is consistent with the fact specially emphasized in the Epistles of the Captivity, that the angels themselves were created beings. Paul here only goes beyond the current belief of Judaism in assigning their creation to Christ.²

3. The knowledge of the angels is limited. This again is common to Jewish and to New Testament thought. In the *Slavonic Enoch* (24³) we read: 'Not even to my angels have I told my secrets, nor have I informed them of their origin, nor have they understood my infinite creation which I tell thee of this day.' And so, according to St. Paul, it is actually one of the privileges of the Church to make known the manifold wisdom of God unto the principalities and the powers in heavenly places (Eph 3¹⁰).³

4. The angels require redemption, or at least reconciliation to God, and it was part of the work of Christ to effect this reconciliation. The idea that angels, unless specified as 'evil' or 'fallen,' are sinless is not supported by the Old Testament. There are not wanting passages which indicate the opposite, as, for example, Job 4¹⁸, 'He putteth no trust in his servants, and his angels he chargeth with folly.'⁴ And so the Apostle includes them in the sweep of the Atonement.

² Col 1¹⁶; on the Jewish view, see St. John Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemp. Jewish Thought*, p. 150.

³ Cf. 1 P 1¹², *ἐς τὴν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἀγγελοὶ παράκνυται*.

⁴ Cf. also 21²², Ps 82¹, Is 24²¹; and see Thackeray, *ut sup*, p. 155.

(To be concluded.)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF CHRONICLES.

He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart.—2 CHRON. XXV. 2.

He did it with all his heart, and prospered.—2 CHRON. XXXI. 21.

1. THE first of these passages refers to Amaziah, the second to Hezekiah. Both were kings of Judah, and both were good men. Of Amaziah it

is said, 'he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord'; and of Hezekiah it is said, 'He wrought that which was good and right and faithful before the Lord his God.' Yet the one failed, and the other succeeded. What was the cause of Amaziah's failure? It was half-heartedness. 'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord,

but not with a perfect heart.' The secret of Hezekiah's success, on the other hand, was his whole-heartedness. 'In every work that he began in the service of the house of God, and in the law, and in the commandments, to seek his God, he did it with all his heart, and prospered.'

2. Let us look at the life and character of these two kings.

(1) *Amaziah*.—Amaziah was twenty-five years of age when he succeeded to the throne. As a boy he had been conscientious and well-behaved. Josephus says, He was exceeding careful of doing what was right, and this when he was very young.

The first thing that he did when he was settled on the throne was to avenge the murder of his father, Joash. A cruel conspiracy had been framed by the servants of the palace, and they had slain the king upon his bed. His son could not rest until these miscreants had been brought to justice. If he had carried out the vindictive practices of his own time, he would have destroyed their families too; but he called to mind an enactment in the law of Moses, to the effect that children should not be made to suffer for the sins of their fathers, and he spared them alive.

The great exploit of his reign was a military campaign against the Edomites. The country of Edom bordered on Palestine, and in the days of king Jehoshaphat it was subject to Judah; but for some time the people had successfully revolted, and Amaziah was seized with the ambition to reduce them to obedience again, and so to extend the glory of his kingdom. Amaziah led forth his army against the Edomites, gaining a signal victory over them in the valley of Salt, where ten thousand were left dead upon the field. Other ten thousand he took as prisoners, and, bringing them to the top of the steep cliffs of that rocky region, threw them over headlong, so that they were dashed in pieces.

His very success, however, proved in the long run to be his ruin. Elated with the splendid victory he had achieved, he forsook the God of his fathers. He was foolish enough to take back into his own country some of the idol gods of Edom, and wicked enough to set them up as objects of worship. Yielding himself to degrading superstition, he actually bowed himself down before these heathen deities, and burned incense to them. On this, a prophet came to him, and rebuked him for his gross idolatry; but this only

provoked the king to rage, and he bade the prophet hold his peace, and threatened to smite him if he interfered. The man of God replied that he would indeed hold his peace, but warned the king that he had incurred the wrath of the Most High, and that his destruction was not far off.

The prediction was fulfilled, and that in a remarkable and tragic manner. Amaziah, puffed up with pride, seems to have fairly lost his head. His great victory over the Edomites gave him a thirst for further conquest. So, in a vein of insolence, he sent a challenge to the king of Israel to come and try their strength in battle.

Amaziah hastened to bring his army to the field; but as soon as his men were drawn up in battle array, a strange, unaccountable panic seized them, so that they fled in every direction, and left their king alone, who was immediately taken prisoner by the enemy. Moreover, to add to his humiliation, Joash threatened to kill him, unless he would persuade the people of Jerusalem, his own capital, to open their gates to the conqueror. This Amaziah did; but, not content therewith, Joash broke down a part of the ancient wall, and drove his chariot through the breach, leading his royal prisoner captive behind him; and not till he had rifled the king's palace, and taken away all the costly treasures of the temple, did he set him at liberty and return to Samaria. The end of Amaziah was a sad one. Betrayed by his own friends, who made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem, he fled to the city of Lachish, but they sent after him, and slew him there.

(2) *Hezekiah*.—There is reason to believe that Amaziah had a pious upbringing, whereas Hezekiah, as the son of Ahaz, is more likely to have been brought up in familiarity with apostasy and evil.

Yet, as soon as he came to the throne, Hezekiah set about reforming the national religion. He abolished idolatry, and restored the worship of Jehovah; he reopened the temple, reinstated the priests and Levites, recommenced the daily service, restored the Passover, and raised so high the religious tone of his country that it was said of him 'there was none like him among all the kings of Judah.'

That he was not deficient in military qualities is shown by his successes against the Philistines, seemingly in the latter part of his reign after the overthrow of Sennacherib (2 K 18⁸), and by the

efficient measures taken by him for the defence of Jerusalem against the Assyrians. But he assiduously cultivated the arts of peace, and by wise management of finance, and the attention which, after the example of David and Uzziah, he paid to agriculture and the increase of flocks and herds, he became possessed, even in troubled times, of an ample exchequer and treasures of wealth (2 Ch 32²⁷⁻²⁹, 2 K 20¹³, Is 39²). Himself a sacred poet, and probably the author of other psalms besides that in Is 38, he seems to have collected the psalms of David and Asaph for the temple-worship, and certainly employed competent scribes to complete the collection of Proverbs.

The great event of his reign was the campaign of Sennacherib against Judah, which ended with the complete discomfiture of the Assyrian king and his mysterious but ignominious return to his own land. This event is celebrated in Byron's famous hymn :

The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold.

Then we have an account of his sickness and miraculous recovery, upon which he received congratulations from Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon. After this embassy we have only a general account of the peace and prosperity in which Hezekiah closed his days. In later times, he was held in honour as the king who had 'after him none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him' (2 K 18⁶); in Jer 26^{17ff} the elders of the land cite him as an example of pious submission to the word of the Lord spoken by Micah; and the son of Sirach closes his recital of the kings with this judgment—that of all the kings of Judah, 'David, Hezekiah, and Josiah alone transgressed not, nor forsook the law of the Most High.'

It is a striking fact that in his early youth Amaziah was in all probability carefully instructed in the knowledge and worship of the Lord. From the express mention of his mother's name, both here and in the Book of Kings, I fancy she was a good and pious woman; and that her faithful training had much to do with the early promise he gave of a useful and honourable career. Many a time, I dare say, Jehoaddan (for such was her name) would take her son aside, and in fervent prayer commend him to the God of his fathers, and tell him of the heroic deeds of some of his saintly ancestors, and point out to him the responsibilities which, in future years, would devolve upon him.¹

Hezekiah, on the other hand, spent his youth in an atmosphere of irreligion and loose living. He was the son of one of the most impious monarchs that ever sat on the throne of Israel. Bad blood was in his veins. His youth was cursed by a most polluted parental example. The abominations of Oriental idolatry were the atmosphere of his childhood. Not in the retirement of a private home, surrounded by better homes, did he live, but among the splendid corruptions of a court which set the current of popular opinion, and defiled the whole kingdom.²

3. Now, when we compare the histories of these two kings, we notice that—

(1) Hezekiah did work that he was called to do, while Amaziah entered upon undertakings solely out of personal ambition.

(2) Amaziah trusted in God for the success of his undertakings, but not whole-heartedly, as Hezekiah did. He gave some of his interest and affections to the gods of Edom. And in those days a divided heart in religion was sure to be followed by failure in life. Is it not so still? Hezekiah made a covenant with Jehovah and stood loyally by it. 'It is in mine heart,' he says, 'to make a covenant with the Lord.' And, strengthened thus, he was able to initiate and carry out a great reform in Israel. Nobody seems to have suggested it to him. No prophet came to warn or to stimulate him. The movement grew up silently in his own heart. God and he planned it alone. Probably he had been brooding over it and praying over it for years. Men do not spring into such honour at a bound. At last he was the soul of the reform. The idea was his; the measures were his; the execution was his. So it often is in other great works of God.³ Some one man heads it; puts his soul into it; gives his life to it; rouses other men, and energizes them in it. There is almost no limit to the power of a live man called of God to a great life's work. Other men fall back to the right and to the left, and let such a man go up the highway of the King, while they fall in at the rear, and acknowledge his lead.

4. Whole-heartedness is necessary to success in every kind of enterprise or work.

(1) Look around you in business. Who are the young men that rise in the establishment? Not the men who sleep behind the counter, who are glad to avoid a customer. Employers soon discover those who throw energy into their work, and they like a young man who has 'push' in him;

¹ J. Thain Davidson, *Forewarned—Fofearmed*, 220.

² Austin Phelps, *The Old Testament*, 111.

he is sure to be promoted, and in time will become a trader on his own account. Who are the merchants that succeed in this busy time of competition? The lazy sluggards? No; the men who are diligent in business, who do what they do with both their hands, who breast the current with all their strength, scorning to be carried down the stream to the cataract of bankruptcy. Who are the men that rise to eminence? Men do not go to bed and wake up in the morning to find themselves famous, at least not until they have encountered many stern labours; for God does not at this day give harvests to idle men except harvests of thistles; nor is He pleased to send wealth to the man who will not dig in the field to find its treasure. It is universally confessed that if a man would prosper, he must be diligent in business; for at this day, beyond every preceding age, is it true, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.'

'Whatever I have tried to do in my life,' said Charles Dickens, 'I have tried with all my heart to do well. What I have devoted myself to, I have devoted myself to completely. Never to put one hand to anything on which I could throw my whole self, and never to affect depreciation of my work, whatever it was, I find now to have been golden rules.'¹

O to be up and doing, O
Unfearing and unshamed to go
In all the uproar and the press
About my human business!
My undissuaded heart I hear
Whisper courage in my ear.
With voiceless calls, the ancient earth
Summons me to a daily birth.²

(2) The same thing is true if we leave mercantile pursuits, and survey any other of the walks of life. If a man would make discoveries in science, he does not hit upon them by accident; but, he being in the way, science meets him. If a man would become eminent as a physician, he must walk the hospitals. If he would attain position at the bar, he must give days and nights to the folios of law. There is no hope for a man in anything in these times unless he proceeds to it with all his heart.

When *ten* men are so earnest on one side that they will sooner be killed than give way, and *twenty* are earnest enough on the other to cast their votes for it, but will not risk their skins, *the ten will give the law to the twenty*, in

virtue of the robust faith, and of the strength which goes along with it.³

One of the most disappointing and dangerous people in society is the man or woman who is agreeable, and plausible, and sparkling, and amusing, but insincere, changeable, and unprincipled and facile. There is no disloyalty, no baseness, such a person may not be capable of, not so much because he is immoral, but because he is slack. You must not count him a friend, since he may cast you off to-morrow; you must not assume he will stand temptation, since his character is weak at the foundation.⁴

(3) It is the same in religion as it is in other things. Do not treat religion as though it were a business; but put as much force, and power, and energy, and heartiness, and earnestness into religion as ever you do into business. Under God the Holy Spirit our only hope lies in the development of energy within us, in the bringing out of earnestness in Christian souls.

Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, had the portrait of Henry Martyn, the tireless missionary, hung on the wall of his study. Whenever he entered his room, the eyes looked upon him, and the lips seemed to say, 'Be earnest; don't trifle.' Simeon was in the habit of bowing to the portrait and saying, 'I will be in earnest; I will not trifle; for souls are perishing, and Jesus is to be glorified.'⁵

5. If we are whole-hearted for Christ, there are three ways in which we will show it:

(1) Our thoughts will be constantly turned to Him and the progress of His kingdom.

The hidden source of the beauty and power of John Wesley's life is to be found in an incident in his College life. He read Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, and it worked on him like a revelation. 'Instantly,' he says, 'I resolved to devote all my life to God, being thoroughly convinced that every part of my life must either be a sacrifice to God or myself—that is, in effect, to the devil.' The life that followed (1735–1791) is the greatest life of the eighteenth century. The measure of his worth was the worth of his aim. He aimed at God.⁶

In the diary of Jonathan Edwards, we find the following account of his feelings towards the Lord's work: 'I had great longing for the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the world; my secret prayer used to be in great part taken up in praying for it. If I heard the least hint of anything that had happened in any part of the world, which appeared to me in some respect or other to have favourable aspect on the interest of Christ's kingdom, my soul eagerly caught at it, and it would much animate and refresh me. I used to be earnest to read public news letters, mainly to that end, to see if I

³ J. A. Froude.

⁴ J. Watson, *The Homely Virtues*, 59.

⁵ J. A. Clapperton.

⁶ *Ibid.*

¹ S. L. Wilson, *Helpful Words for Daily Life*, 175.

² R. L. Stevenson, *Songs of Travel*.

could not find some news favourable to the interest of religion in the world.¹

(2) When we resolve to do something for Him and His kingdom we will carry our resolutions into action,

For still the Lord is Lord of might;
In deeds, in deeds, he takes delight;
The plough, the spear, the laden barks,
The field, the founded city, marks;
He marks the smiler of the streets,
The singer upon garden seats;
He sees the climber in the rocks:
To him, the shepherd folds his flocks.
For those he loves that underprop
With daily virtues Heaven's top,
And bear the falling sky with ease,
Unfrowning caryatides.
Those he approves that ply the trade,
That rock the child, that wed the maid,
That with weak virtues, weaker hands,
Sow gladness on the peopled lands,
And still with laughter, song and shout,
Spin the great wheel of earth about.¹

When a man's heart is right with God, what he has resolved to do he will do. I can speak for one, when I say I know a man who, when he feels that God has given him a work to do, and he has once resolved it shall be done, would move heaven and earth to accomplish it; and he would sooner break his heart or destroy his health than fail in it; for he feels that if it is God's work, it must be done. Man's work may stop, but God's work cannot; and when any get in his way, or seem to thwart his purpose, that man feels his zeal so boiling over that for God's sake he forgets everything else; and even dear friendships snap when it appears as if Christ's cause were imperilled. When a man becomes thoroughly alive for God, he cannot put up with those lazy sluggards who will neither work themselves nor permit others to work.²

(3) And our earnestness will show itself in perseverance. A man falls the first time: 'Never mind,' says he, 'it is God's work; we will try again.' He breaks down again; but he falls to rise. There he sees the mountain-summit glittering in the sunlight; and though he has a burden on his back, he vows, 'I will climb there.' He has fallen down that crag, and he lies there black with bruises, groaning and moaning. The first thing he does when he wipes his eyes of the dust, is to look up, and say, 'I will mount there yet.' He climbs anon, but an antagonist pushes him down. He has not time to stop and examine who it is and resent the insult, but he recommences the ascent. Now and then he runs; when he cannot run he

walks; and when he cannot walk he creeps; and when it seems impossible to go on hands and knees, he is content to pull himself up by his hands alone, oftentimes even grasping a briar and sending a thorn into his flesh, but still saying, 'It is God's place, and He has bid me climb, and in His Divine strength I will do it. I cannot rest, I cannot be quiet till the deed be done.' Perseverance is the sure effect of whole-heartedness for God.

At a time when society was corrupt and hollow to sit heart's core, there was one—his name was Armand de Rancé—who lived in that glittering world with immense applause. Rich, noble, eloquent, handsome, he drank the cup of pleasure to the dregs, and by God's grace, while yet young, found it unutterably bitter. For a time he fell into despair; everything seemed to fall to dust in his hand, to slip into ashes at his touch. But he was not one who, as it were, longed only to purchase a cheap forgiveness, and then still to clutch at every not absolutely forbidden comfort. No; having sinned and suffered, and been forgiven, he felt that henceforth his life was consecrated, not to easy pietisms, but to heroic endeavours. He shook off everything—wealth, love, home, fame—and retired to a monastery deep among the gloomy mountain woods, where, as you approach, you pass by three pillars of Iron, on the first of which is engraved the word *Charity*, on the second *Brotherly Union*, and on the third *Silence*. To this monastery he retired, and found it in a condition truly frightful. The few monks left in it were corrupt, degraded, and ignorant to the last degree. Among these he went alone, but with the avowed hope, the avowed purpose, of reforming them; unarmed save by the force of God, and that strong-sided champion, Conscience. Many attempts were made to waylay and murder him; one monk tried to shoot him in open day. But De Rancé never flinched. He worked with his might, and, God helping him, he prospered. His most violent persecutors became his most steadfast friends. The monk who shot at him became a most humble and holy penitent. And thus, in the irresistible might of a firm purpose and a holy courage, did one man triumph over his own enemies and the enemies of God. He came to a den of robbers and left it a house of prayer.³

Edison, the inventor of the phonograph, is a man of genius certainly, but he is also a tremendous plodder. Witness his difficulty with the single letter S. He could not get the phonograph to reproduce it. From eighteen to twenty hours a day for seven months he worked on the single word 'specia.' He said into the phonograph 'specia, specia, specia,' but the instrument responded 'pecia, pecia, pecia.' It was enough to drive one mad, but he held firm and succeeded at last. Just think of it! From eighteen to twenty hours a day for seven months devoted to one letter.⁴

In Mackay's very last letter to me, his strong, brave heart seemed oppressed with yet another disappointment, and he wrote: 'I feel strongly inclined to throw up the

¹ R. L. Stevenson, *Underwoods*.

² C. H. Spurgeon.

³ F. W. Farrar.

⁴ D. Watson.

whole matter, on the present footing, and try a radically new plan.' Fourteen years of toil, and fever, and contradiction, and sorrow, and repeated disappointment! And he is strongly inclined, not to shake off the dust from his feet, not to return to England, but to try a radically new plan.¹

What if wise men had, as far back as Ptolemy,
Judged that the earth like an orange was round,

¹ R. P. Ashe, in *Mackay of Uganda*, 444.

None of them ever said, Come along, follow me,
Sail to the West, and the East will be found.
Many a day before
Ever they'd come ashore
Sadder and wiser men,
They'd have turned back again;
And that *he* did not, but did cross the sea,
Is a pure wonder, I must say, to me.²

² Clough, *Poems*, 78.

Positive Theological Research in Germany.

BY DR. PAUL FEINE, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE-WITTENBERG.

II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN regard to New Testament study, the greatest commentaries which appeared in the nineteenth century were those of H. A. W. Meyer and J. Chr. Hofmann, the former of moderate conservative tendencies, the latter the representative of the Erlangen Neo-Lutheran theology. Meyer followed the glossator's method. Hofmann began from the general, utilized the particular for the benefit of the general, and always tried to reconstruct the statements of the Biblical writer in their inner form and coherence. It was not his aim to make the text comprehensible by comparing its different parts, but to understand it as an organic whole. He therefore studied carefully the progress of ideas. He did this, however, by entering into detailed discussion of exegetical views differing from his own. His commentary acquired in this way a certain heaviness and obscurity, while Meyer, who also followed out the history of exegesis, especially at important passages, was far more readable.

Nevertheless Hofmann's Commentary has had much greater influence on scientific exegesis than Meyer's. His influence is still at the present day clearly recognizable on some who have followed absolutely different lines of theological study. Even some parts of Meyer's Commentary, as the Prison Epistles, have lately been re-edited by E. Haupt in line with Hofmann's exegesis. On the whole, however, the latest issues of Meyer's Commentary are the work of the critical theologian.

The exegesis of Hofmann suffers, apart from its

heaviness, from several faults which cannot be treated in detail here. Now Th. Zahn in Erlangen, who in theology is a close follower of Hofmann, has undertaken the editing of a Commentary on the New Testament which avoids, at least in great measure, these faults, and at the same time endeavours, in conformity with the resources of present-day science, to utilize the excellences of Hofmann's exegesis. For example, Zahn's commentary follows on the lines laid down by Hofmann in this respect, that it subjects to close examination the inner chain of ideas in the text and so facilitates the understanding of the Biblical writer. A continuous analysis of the ideas of others no longer has a place in the book; instead, Zahn has himself brought his immense knowledge in the sphere of patristic study to bear on the exegesis, so that the expert will find there a rich fund of information. The most important parts of this commentary are those treated by Zahn himself: Matthew, John, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Galatians. His commentary on Matthew, to select one example, has had a phenomenal sale. But the commentaries of his collaborators: Mark, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, the Pastoral Epistles, treated by G. Wohlenberg, Zahn's successor in the professorial chair in Erlangen; 1 and 2 Corinthians, treated by Ph. Bachmann; and the Prison Epistles by P. Ewald, are also excellent pieces of exegetical work.

By the side of this great commentary, a smaller work, destined chiefly for the use of students, is about to be undertaken, under the editorship of B. Bess, with the general title *Evangelisch-theologische Bibliothek*. Just as H. Lietzmann on the critical

side obtained the help of a number of scholars for his *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, so for this conservative work the following have placed themselves at Bess's disposal: J. Leipoldt, who will treat the Synoptics; W. Lütgert, the Gospel and Epistles of St. John; G. Hönnicke, the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse; E. Kühl, the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Galatians; A. Juncker, the Epistles to the Corinthians; and several other scholars. This commentary is to contain textual criticism, discussions of grammar and vocabulary, exegesis in the narrower sense, questions of exegetical controversy, Biblical criticism, references, parallels from religious history, and an estimate of the significance of the part under discussion for the continuity of the book, and as viewed in the light of a history of primitive Christianity.

But Bess's *Evangelisch-theologische Bibliothek* is more than a commentary. Its first part consists of a series of compendia for the separate branches of theology. The want of short comprehensive works of this kind has made itself widely felt in Germany. For students, teachers, clergymen, religious scholars, and those interested in religious matters, many of the religious text-books are too comprehensive and not always suitable for rapid reference. As a librarian, Bess has had ample opportunity for discovering this. When it came to the working out of the proposed plan, it was conservative theologians who placed themselves at his disposal. Sellin wrote the introduction to the Old Testament; the present writer undertook the introduction to the New Testament and the religion of the New Testament; F. Arnold, Church History; F. Kropatscheck, Dogmatics; P. Althaus, Ethics; J. Kunze, Symbolics; R. Seeberg, the History of the Theology of the Nineteenth Century; and so on.

Alongside of those smaller condensed works, attention has also been paid to larger handbooks. While in the critical branch of theology comprehensive works are being published by J. C. B. Mohr in Tübingen, in the *Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher*, and in the smaller volumes of the *Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften*, a *Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher* in the conservative branch of theology has been undertaken by the publishing firm of A. Deichert, late W. Scholl, in Leipzig, the same firm which is publishing the commentaries of Zahn and Sellin. The following

have already appeared in this series: Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*; E. Lehmann, *Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte*; R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*; Frank Grützmacher, *Geschichte der neueren Theologie*; L. Ihmels, *Christliche Wahrheitsgewissheit*; M. Kähler, *Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*. Other volumes are still to follow, e.g. W. Lütgert, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*; P. Feine, *Leben Jesu*; A. Seeberg, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*; Church History, by G. Grützmacher and H. Böhmer; Symbolics, by W. Walther; Apologetics, by A. W. Hunzinger; Ethics, by R. H. Grützmacher.

We shall now make a more exhaustive survey of some comprehensive works of New Testament study which have appeared within the last few years. Until a few years ago, in the sphere of introduction to the New Testament, the works of H. J. Holtzmann and A. Jülicher on the side of historical criticism, and that of B. Weiss in conservative theology, were the chief. Now Th. Zahn has published his *Introduction to the New Testament*, in two volumes, 3rd edition, 1907. In this work Zahn has handled a great mass of scientific material with brilliant insight and scholarship. The uniqueness of Zahn's method lies in this, that he starts with Church tradition and, as a rule, comes to conclusions which are in harmony with it. Even those who object to this method will not be able to come away from the study of this work without taking with them a rich fund of information. Controversy with Zahn is always fruitful. A shorter introduction to the New Testament, which pays more attention to the needs of students, and so does not always explain the problems fully, is written by F. Barth, 2nd ed. 1911. The same scholar has also written a very convenient and serviceable book as a contribution to the investigation of the life of Christ, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*⁴, 1911.

The text-books on Biblical theology which were chiefly used at the end of last century were those of B. Weiss and W. Beyschlag from the moderate conservative standpoint, and those of H. J. Holtzmann from the critical standpoint. In the sphere of positive theology, two new Biblical theologies have now appeared, those of A. Schlatter, 2 vols. 1909 and 1910, and of Feine, 1910, 3rd and 4th thousand, 1912, to which was added last year the critical religio-historical theology of H. Weinle. Although Schlatter and Feine have been influenced

to a great extent in their fundamental ideas by Hofmann of Erlangen, yet they proceed by very different ways and pursue different methods. Schlatter has given an exposition of the principles followed by him in a special work entitled 'Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments und die Dogmatik' in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 1909, xiii. 2. According to this work, he regards as the first task of Biblical theology the perception of the given facts, and the observation of the processes by which the New Testament convictions have come into being. It must be clearly demonstrated how one tenet has been evolved out of the other, and how every single tenet is bound up with the whole consciousness and concentrated will of the person who thought it out and wrote it down. Schlatter demands that a simplified scheme of the religious process should be used as the basis of investigation, so that for those processes which are essential to every stage of piety and every particular form of faith, the New Testament data ought to be collected. He says that by extracting from the New Testament the convictions which are closely bound up in Christian experience as their causes and effects, we get New Testament theology. For the word of the New Testament does not consist of creations of the mind which have come into being quite apart from will and conduct, but of those which have grown out of the experience of life and have been created for it. As is obvious from this, Schlatter is especially concerned to give a picture of the religious and ethical life of the personalities of the New Testament. He desires to sketch the sum of facts exemplified by their lives, and to establish the inferences to be drawn from them for the Christian community. In this he consciously limits himself to the complex of tradition embodied in the New Testament.

In my theology of the New Testament I have also tried, above all, to bring to light the facts which may be gathered from the New Testament writings. Again and again in them we come upon a distinctive religious life, which in its manifestations and results is plainly visible. For the understanding of these documents, however, investigation is not limited to the sphere of the New Testament; the lines of communication leading back into the Old Testament and Jewish literature are followed out, and the whole mass of material contributed by modern research in the field of

religious history is brought to bear on the subject. Thus it is made evident almost everywhere that New Testament religion is firmly grounded in Old Testament religion but goes beyond it, that the science of comparative religion contributes a not unimportant result in that it shows the forms in which primitive Christianity was able to make itself comprehensible to the people of that time, but that its true content and its religious nature can be understood only from the Divine person of Jesus and the power which flowed from Him. Further, as a result of this, it is manifest that the conception of the two great Apostles, Paul and John, held in critical work up till now, stands in need of correction. They have frequently (by Holsten, Pfeiderer, Holtzmann, and also on the conservative side by B. Weiss) been regarded predominantly in an intellectual light. Their doctrinal views were described in critical theology under the scheme of a combination of genuine Christian and Hellenistic elements, so that a glaring dualism was often apparent in them. The matter takes on another complexion, however, if we try to understand, from Christian experience and dependence on the gospel of Jesus, the intellectual world of Paul and John, in view of the stage of religious development they had reached. In this way the living and personal side of their declaration of faith is brought out much more clearly.

Of no less importance for the present theological situation is the course taken by two great New Testament discussions of late years—the question of Paul's dependence on Jesus, and the historicity of the Biblical picture of Jesus.

At the time when I was forming my own opinions upon theological matters, I discovered that one of the greatest theological problems which exist was the question, in what measure Pauline religion and theology were dependent on the historical Jesus. Accordingly, in 1899, I published *Das gesetzessfreie Evangelium des Paulus nach seinem Werdegang dargestellt*, in which, entering into discussion, more especially with C. Holsten, I followed out the lines of communication between the pre-Christian and the Christian life ideal of Paul, and proved at the same time that the reality of the occurrence at Damascus offers the key to the understanding of Paul's conversion from a Pharisee into an Apostle. In 1902 the further work *Jesus Christus und Paulus* was published, in which the question of the dependence of Paul on Jesus, treated in

various independent inquiries, was summarized and gone into more deeply. The result of my research was that Paul must have been much better acquainted and much more thoroughly conversant with the gospel of Jesus, His words, thoughts, and deeds, than would appear from a superficial examination. The proclamation and teaching of Paul on the subject of the person of Jesus, his faith in God, his doctrine of redemption and justification, his ethics, his position with regard to the law, his views on the sacraments, and his eschatology, are in my opinion only an acceptance and continuation of what was already directly present in Jesus or certainly prepared in Him. My opinions found a favourable reception in some quarters, even on the side of historical criticism (Holtzmann), but for the most part they raised dissent; in fact, an attempt was made to come to a directly opposite conclusion. W. Wrede maintained in his *Paulus*, 1905, that it was an undeniable fact that the life-work and the personality of Jesus had *not* influenced Pauline theology. The name 'Apostle of Jesus' was in no way suitable for Paul, if by that was meant his historical relationship to Jesus. In all essential points he was, in comparison with Jesus, an entirely new being; he was the second founder of Christianity, and as such he had, in comparison with the first, exercised, if not the better, at least the stronger, influence. Paul, so Wrede maintained, was much more independent of Jesus than Jesus Himself was of the noblest representatives of Jewish religion. This raised a lively discussion upon the subject of Jesus and Paul. Even the theological friends of Wrede found his judgment too extreme. Scholars even on his own side began to recognize numerous points of connexion between Jesus and Paul. By going into the religious and theological views of the primitive community, they noticed that Paul's proclamation of Christ, as well as his ethics and eschatology, agreed to a great extent with Christianity as it was before his own time. Even in those circles where stress was laid on the originality of the Pauline gospel, an active search was made for points of connexion not only between Paul and contemporary religion and mythology, but also between him and the historical Jesus.

Numerous scholars took part in this discussion, e.g. Goguel in France; in Germany, Kölbing, J. Kaftan, Jülicher, M. Brückner, J. Weiss, and

others.¹ People were brought to reason, however, by the course taken by the discussion upon the Christ-myth. We may regard as a favourable sign the remarks which H. Weinel, though belonging to the critical branch of theology, has addressed to his theological colleagues, in a descriptive survey of this dispute. Again and again, says Weinel in his paper, *Ist das liberale Jesusbild widerlegt?* 1910, p. 16, critical theology has laid stress on how little one may learn of Jesus from Paul. He himself had formerly placed the matter in this false light. He now admits, however, not only that what Paul says about Jesus and His words is enough to prove the existence of Jesus in the Epistles of Paul, but that in all important passages the words of Jesus are heard in Paul; and that besides a whole host of details which Paul knew and wrote down, the decisive characteristics of Jesus' preaching and character have been preserved for us in the writings of this Apostle. Thus the opinion which we have long held is thoroughly justified. Let us give a warm welcome to the work of the Norwegian, P. Olaf Moe, *Paulus und die evangelische Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1912, in which the close connexion between the proclamation of Paul and the gospel of Jesus is once more demonstrated.

A unique view of the Apostle appeared last year in A. Deissmann's *Paulus*. In the same way as Renan once tried to explain the gospel of Jesus from the knowledge of the country and people of Palestine, so Deissmann now tries to explain the Apostle from the blue sky, the sultry summer heat of the East, the wearisome mountain paths over which the Apostle had to wander, and so on. What is really theological he takes away from Paul almost entirely, and sees in him the mystic, the man of moods, the meditative spirit. We fear that only a small part of this theory will prove to be tenable.

The dispute about the so-called 'Christ-myth,' which has been raging for the last three years in Germany, did not break out by chance. With Bruno Bauer, 1841; A. Kalthoff, *Das Christusproblem*, 1902, *Die Entstehung des Christentums*, 1903; W. von Schnehen, *Der moderne Jesuskultus*, 1905; W. B. Smith, *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, Giessen, 1906; P. Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*

¹ See also the article 'Jesus and Paul,' by John Gresham Machen, in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, by the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1912, pp. 547-578.

in der Weltliteratur, i. 1906, the ground had been well prepared for the attack on the historical portrait of Jesus which was made by Arthur Drews, Professor of Philosophy in the Polytechnic in Karlsruhe, in his work *Die Christusmythe*, Jena, 1909, Pt. II. 1911. Drews maintained that the gospel writings did not contain the history of a real man, but only the myth of the 'God-man,' Jesus, clothed in the form of history. Old Testament prototypes of the Messiah (Moses, Elias, Elisha, etc.), as well as certain mythical conceptions of the neighbouring heathen tribes—conceptions which were closely connected with the belief in a Divine Redeemer—had contributed to the 'history' of that Jesus. Everything of consequence and of decisive religious importance in the Christian faith, as, for example, the baptism, the last supper, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, was borrowed from the cult symbolism of the mythical Jesus, and owed its rise not to an historical fact, but to the pre-Christian faith in the half-Jewish, half-heathen redeeming Deity.

The theological deductions of Drews are diletante, through and through. He has made the most glaring mistakes and omissions; he has taken very little trouble, before publishing his opinions on these matters, to investigate them thoroughly in a scientific way. The mainspring of his argument, however, is, as is clearly seen in his work, his monistic view of things. That this has led him to take up a position of antagonism to historical Christianity is only natural. But our opponents have, as is well known, the sharpest eye for our weaknesses, and so Drews has undoubtedly discovered a vulnerable point in the armour of theological research. This is the argument of liberal theology that an historical portrait of Jesus which does not overstep the limits of the human may be obtained from the Gospels by means of historical criticism. The bitter arguments of Drews and his colleagues are directed against the religious worship of the ideal man, Jesus. It has time and again been pointed out by the representatives of the theory of the Christ-myth that 'the *Jesuanism* of liberal theology,' i.e. the claim to be able to draw a true portrait of Christ on the foundation of historical criticism, is a Utopia; what really appears in the Gospels is the portrait of the Son of God who appeared on earth as Redeemer.

It is not without a certain amount of justifica-

tion that Drews and his colleagues claim that the logical result of liberal-theological research is the complete denial of the historical existence of Jesus. Bousset—who has since, it must be admitted, taken up the symbolical view of the person of Jesus—in his controversy with Kalthoff in the first decade of this century, would allow only a few of Jesus' words to stand as historically trustworthy—such as the Parable of the Prodigal Son, the declaration of the Fatherly love of God, or Jesus in dispute with the Pharisees. In his *Messiasgeheimnis*, 1901, Wrede tried to prove that the contents of Mark's Gospel along with Christ's proclamation of Himself as the Messiah before Cesarea Philippi are in their essential points nothing but a new form of the primitive Christian communal tradition, so that Jesus probably never did designate Himself the Messiah. In the same direction, Wellhausen, in his works upon the Synoptic Gospels advances a very far-reaching criticism.

Thus the impression was naturally made upon outsiders that everything was still rather obscure in the field of critical research into the Gospels, and that an entirely new construction was necessary. Was an impetus in that direction not given when the whole portrait of Christ in the Gospels was declared unhistorical and the rise of the gospel tradition explained otherwise?

The objections of the representatives of the Christ-myth to the liberal portrait of Jesus correspond to a great extent, so far as contents are concerned, to what we on the modern positive side have always brought against the liberal portrait of Jesus, and always will bring against it. The only difference is that we as colleagues aim at a more friendly style of polemic, while they set to work in much more drastic fashion. In particular, we have always shown that the transmission of the Gospels offered no excuse for suppressing some of the features of the portrait of Jesus while setting up the rest as historically certain. We also recognized that the real reason for such a differentiation did not lie in the sources, but in the mind of the critic.

Those representing the theory of the Christ-myth have no intention of pursuing a course of apologetics. The Christian belief in a divinely human Redeemer is nothing more to them than a myth. But the real reason of this judgment is not historical but religio-philosophical; or, to express it differently, it is a judgment of the volition. Here we find ourselves, however, outside the sphere of

what may be scientifically proved. At the same time those holding this view have formed correct opinions on many points. Historical tradition in itself does not offer the security which faith needs. A simple historical personage cannot be the foundation of religious faith. A man, though he be an ideal man, cannot redeem us. The gospel has from the very beginning, however, always been the proclamation of the Divine Jesus sent by God into the world for our redemption. This mission may be accepted or rejected; it cannot be changed. So we conservative theologians held ourselves in reserve at first in this dispute. We have followed with great pleasure the many tendencies on the part of the critical school towards a deeper view of the Person of Jesus; but we think that our particular task lies in penetrating with the means and methods of present-day scientific research into the fulness, the wealth and the super-historicity of the Biblical evidence of Christ, and in so working at our part that our knowledge also may help to bear

witness to the majesty of Christ as our Divine Saviour.

In conclusion, we may call attention to the unique attempt of a conservative theologian to find the beginnings of ecclesiastical dogma in the Apostolic period. A. Seeberg has in a number of works, of which the most important are *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 1903; *Das Evangelium Christi*, 1904; *Christi Person und Werk nach der Lehre seiner Jünger*, 1910, tried to prove the existence in the Apostolic period of a christological dogma, which forms the foundation of the second article of the Apostolic Confession of Faith. This dogma Seeberg considers as 'the gospel' which was preached from the beginning by Jesus' disciples, and he traces the origin of this gospel back to Jesus Himself. Even though these contentions will not easily be justified, yet Seeberg is at any rate right in this, that the beginnings of creed-making reach back to New Testament times.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Feine's 'New Testament Theology.'¹

THE first edition of this excellent work was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, July 1910, pp. 454-456. Its comprehensiveness of treatment, sanity of judgment, and religious insight have carried it already into the honour of a second edition; and, as the author has diligently worked over many sections, it deserves more than a mere chronicle of its appearance in this form. Numerically, there are only ten more pages. But Dr. Feine has introduced a much larger amount of material than this addition would suggest; a number of paragraphs have been abbreviated; small print has been used pretty freely; and in this way space has been secured for fresh matter² which often clears up the processes of argument. These changes make it practically a new book, although there is no retreat from the conclusions of the original edition.

The chapters on the Synoptic Gospels have been radically re-cast. Instead of starting with the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, Dr. Feine, in deference to his critics, now begins with the attitude of Jesus towards Judaism; this is followed by Jesus' call to repentance, and by a chapter on the kingdom of God,³ which leads up to the moral demands of Jesus (replacing a chapter on his ethics, which formerly stood between chapters 8 and 9). The seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters on 'Die Versöhnung,' 'The resurrection, return, and judgment,' and 'the permanent significance of the person of Jesus,' remain on the whole much as they were, with the exception of the first, in which the author has stated with greater precision his view that the redemptive element is organic to the teaching of our Lord (p. 167 f.). There is a detailed defence (p. 152 f.) of the authenticity of the ransom-saying (Mt 20²⁸ = Mk 10⁴⁵); it goes back, Feine thinks, to a combination, in the

¹ *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Von D. Dr. Paul Feine. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911. Zweite, stark umgearbeitete Auflage. M. 12.50: geb. 14.50.

² Particularly in connexion with the *religionsgeschichtliche* movement, which is criticized not only in the introductory chapters, but throughout the course of the whole book.

³ In this chapter (p. 68) Dr. Feine frankly admits that neither Mt 16^{18f.} nor Mt 18^{18f.} are authentic sayings of Jesus, as they stand. Both represent the standpoint of the Jewish Christian Church, though some genuine word of Jesus may be at the root of the former passage.

consciousness of Jesus, of the 'Son of Man' idea and 'the Suffering Servant' idea, and it tallies not only with the meaning of the Lord's Supper, but with Christ's whole conception of His death as an atoning sacrifice. One of the outstanding features of the whole book (e.g. pp. 103 f., 146 f., 187 f., etc.) is the opposition to anything like a distinction between a Jesus-religion and a Christian-religion in the N.T. It will be obvious, therefore, that Dr. Feine cannot sympathize with any recent claims for Paul as the founder of Christian theology. He finds the religious presuppositions of Paul's doctrine already present in the consciousness and teaching of Jesus.

In the introductory chapter upon Paulinism a new section on the principles of Pauline criticism (pp. 220-223) is introduced.¹ But more significant is the fact that chapters 6 and 7 of the first edition, on 'Paul's conception of Christ' and 'The significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus, have been not only re-cast but put forward to the front of the discussion on Paul's theology, replacing the chapters on 'Sin,' 'Paul's relation to the Law and Judaism,' 'das Schriftprinzip,' and 'God.' A new chapter on the Pauline Gnosis is also inserted after the chapter on the Spirit. The whole section is a masterpiece of condensed statement, whatever may be thought of some of its particular conclusions.

The indebtedness of the Fourth Gospel's Theology to Paulinism (p. 539 f.) is discussed under four headings: (i.) It is to Paul that we ultimately owe the sense of Christ's universal significance and of Christianity as a religion for the world. (ii.) The supersession of Judaism, which is presupposed in the Fourth Gospel, follows from this achievement of Paul. (iii.) Even the Pauline Christology, in spite of its peculiar features, has paved the way for the Johannine idea of Christ as the likeness and firstborn and fullness of God. (iv.) Finally, the conception of Christ as God's supreme revelation of love, is carried on from Paul into the special interests of the Johannine theology. To the latter problem Dr. Feine has devoted great pains, in both editions. In the second it is noticeable that the Johannine theology precedes, instead of following, the section upon the other post-Pauline writings of the N.T., while the Apocalypse has been shifted from the former to

the latter (a step in advance, although Dr. Feine thinks we cannot describe as 'impossible' the Church-tradition which ascribes both the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John). A new chapter on the relation of John to Judaism has been added, which includes some paragraphs on the odes of Solomon (pp. 549-550). He rightly regards the odes as steeped not in Jewish, but in Oriental, gnostic mysticism, and as influenced by the N.T., instead of throwing light on any incipient 'Johannine' conceptions within the Christianity of the first century, much less within Judaism. The chapter on the relation between John and Hellenism has been re-named and re-cast, and the concluding chapter on the details of the Johannine doctrine of salvation has been much enlarged. In noticing Reitzenstein's argument from the Hermetic literature, Dr. Feine arrives at a negative conclusion which is not altogether unjustified. 'R.'s investigations throw fresh light on the religious idea of the Logos outside the Christianity of the church, on the significance of Egyptian theologumena for the later syncretism of paganism and gnosticism, and on the history of the Hermetic and Egyptian literature of revelation; but none of the extant Hermetic writings goes back earlier than the third century A.D., and therefore they contribute nothing of direct importance for an inquiry into the contemporary ideas with which John came into conflict' (p. 558). Neither here nor elsewhere will the reader of this handbook encounter what Dr. Johnson called 'learning confused by the multiplicity of its own views.' Dr. Feine deals conscientiously with all sorts of opinions, but he has a mind of his own, and the knack of expressing it crisply.

The concluding section upon 'Die theologischen Anschauungen der gemeinchristlichen Schriften' starts with the Apocalypse, and then discusses, as before, Hebrews, James, First Peter, Jude, Second Peter, Mark, Matthew, and the Lucan writings. The character of the materials makes this part of Dr. Feine's work rather discursive. It is the least suggestive section of his book. In discussing the Virgin-Birth (p. 679 f.) he rejects, of course, the $\delta\varsigma \dots \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$ reading of John 1¹⁸ as irrelevant to the context, and admits that the stories in Mt 1 and Lk 1 are neither strong nor homogeneous evidence; still, it is argued, this dogma or tradition expresses a truth which is directly related to the valuation of Christ's person

¹ The theology of the Pastoral Epistles is, of course, treated separately (p. 503 f.); they are evidence for the later interests of the Church.

by Christian faith. Incidentally (p. 688 f.) he considers, against Harnack, that the hymns in Lk 1-2 belong to a special Jewish-Christian tradition. In the synoptic Gospels he refuses to see Pauline or anti-Pauline tendencies; but the growing 'Catholicism' of the Church, behind Matthew and Luke, is candidly recognized. Second Peter is pseudonymous (pp. 670-672), and the Alexandrian element in Hebrews (p. 644 f.) is estimated,¹ though not with an adequate appreciation of its full influence upon the theology of the Epistle.

This section, indeed, is a sort of anti-climax, after the cardinal topics of Jesus, Paul, and John; it would have been still more so, had not Dr. Feine added seventeen pages, by way of a special summary, upon the main ideas of N.T. Theology (pp. 689-706). This recapitulates the conclusions of the earlier sections. In speaking of the Gospel, he refuses to take the genitive in τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ as genitivus subjecti (p. 690). Paul's idea of Christ as the object and content of the Gospel tallies with Christ's own view of His person as central to the cause of the kingdom. 'The chief and all-embracing truth for Paul is not the idea of the founding and realization of the kingdom through the Son, but the reality of God's saving will and power bound up in Christ; and this was already the kernel of the preaching of Jesus upon earth' (p. 692).

The volume is capitally indexed. The literature cited is nearly all German; hardly any English works on N.T. theology seem to be known to the writer, and very few French. This is a provincialism, however, in which Dr. Feine is not singular. Fortunately, the defect is less serious than it would have been if his work had been shaped on the scale and method of Holtzmann's.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Oxford.

A Survey.

The Bible.

PROFESSOR KARL MARTI of Berne has revised his *Kurzgefasste Grammatik der Biblisch-Aramäischen Sprache* for a second edition. It belongs to the series entitled 'Porta Linguarum Orientalium.'

¹ Similarly, the Philonic and Hellenistic hinterland of the Fourth Gospel (p. 551 f.) is recognized much more frankly by Feine than, e.g., by Beyschlag or B. Weiss

The publishers are Messrs. Reuther & Reichard of Berlin (M.4.50).

A series of volumes under the general title of 'Handböcker i Teologi' has been projected by some of the most learned theologians of Sweden. The series is to be published in Stockholm by Messrs. P. A. Norstedt & Sons. Those who are responsible for the series have done wisely in persuading Professor Erik Stave to open it with a volume entitled *Inledning till Gamla Testamentets Kanoniska Skrifter* (7 kr. 50 öre). Professor Stave is a most accomplished theologian. He has made himself master of the history of religion, having discovered that the comparative study of religion is essential to the understanding of the Old Testament, or, indeed, to any fruitful work in theology; and he is well acquainted with English as well as with German literature. This is a handsome volume, original and up to date.

Lic. theol. Wilhelm Möller has written an account of a new conception of the problem of the Pentateuch under the title of *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung* (Bertelsmann; M.3).

Once more an investigation, thorough and independent, has been made into the Chronology of the Old Testament. The author is Professor Antonio Deimel of Rome. The whole of the Babylonian literature has been taken account of, and the results have been set forth in a magnificent set of tables and charts. These charts contain a complete list of the kings of Babylonia and Assyria. The lists are given in cuneiform, with translation, and the approximate dates are inserted. This valuable work has been published by Max Bretschneider in Rome, under the title of *Veteris Testamenti Chronologia Monumentis Babylonico-Assyriis Illustrata* (4s. 6d.).

Professor Karl Marti has published his Rectorial Address at Berne, under the title of *Stand und Aufgabe der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart* (Max Drechsel; 80 pf.).

The Psalms in Hebrew, with an English translation and brief textual notes, in a fine large volume and beautifully printed (*Die Psalmen, hebräisch und deutsch mit einem kurzen wissenschaftlichen Kommentar*), has been published in Graz and Vienna by Dr. Rivard Schlögl, Professor in the University of Vienna. The publishing house is the Verlagsbuchhandlung 'Styria' (M.10).

The second volume of Lietzmann's 'Catenenstudien' is entitled *Die Catene des Vaticanus Gr.*

1802 zu den Proverbien. The transcription is due to Dr. Otto Hoppmann (Hinrichs ; M.10).

Messrs. Hinrichs are also the publishers of a brochure by Professor Strack, entitled *P'sahim der Mišnatraktat Passafest* (M.1.80).

Under the title of *Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu*, Dr. Heinrich Schumacher has published a critical and exegetical study of Mt 11²⁷, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; and neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' It is one of the most elaborate and exhaustive studies of a Scripture text that we have had for a long time.

An essay by Bertram, Bishop of Norwich, on the origin and meaning of the title 'Son of Man,' has been published by Mr. Murray both in Latin and in English. The title is *De Verbis Filius Hominis* (1s. 6d. net).

To the literature on the historicity of Jesus add *Wissen wir etwas Sicheres über Jesus?* by Johannes Jeremias (Deichert ; M.0.80).

The same publishers issue what is called a 'religio-psychological' study by Lic. Dr. Werner Elert, under the title of *Die Religiosität des Petrus*, (M.1.50).

They also publish a volume of talks to young theologians on the parables in Mt 13, with the title *Altes und Neues aus dem Schatz eines Hausvaters* (M.2.40).

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have issued the last portion of the new edition of H. J. Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*, as edited by Jülicher & W. Bauer (1s. 6d.).

The latest issue of Harnack's 'Beiträge' is entitled *Über den privaten Gebrauch der Heiligen Schriften in der Alten Kirche* (Hinrichs ; M.3).

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

IV.

(1) THE adequacy of the metaphysical formulæ used in regard to the Person of Christ can only be tested by a minute examination of the terms employed. The most famous term is *ὁμοούσιον*, consubstantial, which is expanded in the phrase *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς*. (i.) It is well known that the term gave great offence to many conservative theologians, for it was suspected as having been used by Sabellianism, in which the three persons (*πρόσωπα*, not *ὑποστάσεις*) are only modes, successive in time, of the *οὐσία* (substantia) of God, who is unity (*μονάς*). These modes are consubstantial, and so *ὁμοούσιον* appeared to threaten a return to this modal monarchianism. (ii.) We must trace the use of the term *οὐσία* further back in order to fix the meaning of Athanasius, and thus to show whether this reproach was justified or not. 'The term *οὐσία* (essence) in Aristotle, signified first a thing in the concrete, which is a subject and cannot be a predicate, an individual object, the supporter of attributes; and secondly, a class, be it a species or a larger class, a genus'

(Fisher's *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 137). This ambiguity of the term is a serious defect when it is used in precise definition to mark off orthodoxy from heresy. It is certain that Athanasius did not mean that Christ was an individual of a divine species or genus, and the Father another; for that would have been a return to polytheism, and would have made the trinity not a unity, but a society. Popular Christian language, it must be observed, often comes perilously near such tritheism. But, on the other hand, if Athanasius had meant that Father and Son are an individual subject, the supporter of attributes, he would have fallen back into modalism, a denial of the eternal distinction of Father and Son in the unity of the Godhead. His meaning lies between regarding Christ and God as one individual, and as two individuals of one species or genus. While more is meant than a qualitative similarity, not quite as much as a quantitative identity is intended. Neither of the two original senses of the term *οὐσία* can be carried over into

the meaning he assigned to *ὁμοούσιον*. Certainly the rival term *ὁμοιούσιον* was not preferable, for it denies both the unity of substance and even the sameness of the class to which Christ and God belong. (iii.) The Creed of Chalcedon, probably unintentionally, takes advantage of the ambiguity of the term to describe Christ as also *ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα*. This must mean that Christ and we belong to the same species—man, for it is not likely that the fathers assumed an individual entity—mankind, to which individual men hold similar relation as the Father and the Son to the unity of the Godhead. The following clause seems to indicate this *κατὰ πάντα ὁμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*; Christ is not one with us, but like to us as belonging to the same species. This difference in the meaning of the term *οὐσία* may perhaps be made plainer by an illustration in our English speech. It means both the abstract general as mankind, and the concrete general as *the man*. To speak of Christ's divinity or Godhead is not to affirm what Athanasius meant by *ὁμοούσιον*. He intended to assert that the Son no less and no otherwise than the Father belongs to the one God.

(2) Again, how far does the phrase *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς* carry us? This is the Nicene formula; the Chalcedon Creed reads: *πρὸ αἰῶνον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα*, and *ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου τῆς Θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα*. The Athanasian statement runs: 'Dome est ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitus: Home ex substantia Matris in saeculo natus.' Here, again, words are used ambiguously: (i.) The generation out of the substance of the Father expresses in the intention of the Creed distinction but not separation; the generation out of the substance of the mother surely expresses separation. Thus the Nicene formula, if we were to interpret it by the parallelism in the Athanasian, would not necessarily guard the unity of Father and Son in the Godhead, but might mean separation as well as distinction. Two further questions about this language may be asked. (ii.) Does not the term *generation*, even when qualified by the epithet *eternal*, suggest not only the origin of one individual in another, but even the subsequent separation of the one from the other? Again, in the phrase in the Athanasian symbol *ex substantia Matris*, is not the term *substantia* used in a more narrowly physical reference than its proper mean-

ing allows? A physical analogy may illustrate the different senses of the parallel phrases. As the branch may be said to be of the substance of the tree, so is the Son of the Father; as the offspring is of the substance of the parent, so is Christ of Mary. One other consideration must at this point be advanced. It will be observed how carefully the derivation from Mary is guarded by the qualifying phrase *κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα*. Is the description of Mary as *τῆς Θεοτόκου* not illogical, inconsistent? If the being generated from Mary was confined to the manhood, how can the generating be extended to the Godhead? One feels that the title is inserted not because it was necessary, but because the phrase had been accepted as orthodox.

(3) Another term employed, the meaning of which is ambiguous, is *φύσις*. In the phrase *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν*, or *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, the term seems to be nearly, if not quite, equivalent to *οὐσία*. Popularly nature and substance are used interchangeably; but, strictly defined, the difference is that between manhood and mankind or the man. The substance is the existent entity; the nature is the totality of its attributes or characteristics. 'Different substances might have attributes in common, and so their natures might be similar; but they themselves remained distinct, and in thought at least could be distinguished from their natures; while the natures, too, of different things might have much in common with one another, but yet remained distinct, and could be spoken of almost as if they were real existences in themselves. This, however, was only a loose mode of speech—the reality was always the "substance" to which the nature belonged. The "nature" was not conceived of as being the "substance," nor the "substance" as being the "nature." "It" was not "its nature," nor was "its nature" "it" (Bethune-Baker, p. 48). (i.) Recognizing this distinction, we may urge that what the Creed of Chalcedon did by changing from the term *οὐσία* to the term *φύσις* was to introduce ambiguity in the statement. Whenever we sum up the orthodox Christology in the phrase 'two natures in one person,' we do not mean exactly what the fathers intended. They meant to affirm two substances in the one person, unconfused and unchanged, although they used at this point 'nature' for 'substance.' They meant a divine subject and a human subject distinct the one from the other, in one person (*πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις*),

as the subsequent disputes about one will or two wills show. (ii.) What most persons using the formula to-day would probably mean (and think themselves, under cover of the ambiguity of language, in close agreement with the creeds), is this, one subject possessing both human and divine attributes in so far as these are consistent. We identify subject and person: it is one and the same self that thinks, feels, wills; and it is difficult, if not impossible, for us to think two subjects or selves, God and man, in the unity of one person. (iii.) The Athanasian Creed confirms an interpretation of the Chalcedonian, for it runs: 'Unus domino, non confusione Substantiae, sed Unitate Personae.' It is two substances, subjects of attributes in the strict sense of the word, and not two natures in the proper use of the term, that the Creed of Chalcedon means to assert as united, unmixed, unchanged, undivided, unseparated, in one person. (4) These four adverbs deserve closer study as they set the bounds within which the conception of the union of the natures, or more strictly the substances, must be confined. (i.) ἀσυνγίγως, 'without confusion,' forbids the thought of any blending into the unity of one subject of subjects so distinguished from, nay, even opposed to, one another as God and man; and the reason is distinctly given in the explanatory declaration of the Council 'by this confusion teaching the monstrous doctrine that the divine nature of the only-begotten is passable.' While the man in Christ suffered, it is, according to this Council, monstrous to believe that the God in Him suffered with the man. This is the pagan notion of the gods 'careless of mankind'; it is certainly not the God and Father revealed in the Son and Saviour. One subject in Christ thus suffered, and the other did not, and could not. How can we conceive any personal unity here? (ii.) ἀτρέπτως, 'without conversion,' forbids the thinking any real humiliation of God, or any real exaltation of man in the Incarnation. Paul's declaration in ch 2⁷ (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν) would be heresy to be condemned. This is the *static* view of God and man, while the Scriptural view, and the view of modern theology is *dynamic*. This too is an inheritance from Greek philosophy which exalted Being above becoming, which conceived ultimate reality as substance, and not as spirit. And it is surely quite impossible for us with our different outlook to accept this limitation. (iii.) ἀδιαπέρατος and

ἀχωρίστως, 'without division,' 'never to be separated,' may be taken together as asserting against Nestorius, or rather against what Nestorius was supposed to teach the unity of Christ's person. The doctrine of two substances (οὐσΐαι), however, makes it difficult, nay, impossible, to understand how the framers of the creed would have us conceive the unity concretely. Their assertion 'the distinction of natures being in no wise done away because of the union, but rather the characteristic property of each nature being preserved, and concurring into one Person and one substance,' becomes intelligible in the measure in which we recognize the affinity of God and man, and God's communicativeness in grace, and man's receptiveness in faith, and depart from the rigid separation of God and man which is throughout the creed assumed. The first two adverbs against Eutyches and Apollinaris are inconsistent with the last two directed against Nestorius. These inconsistencies show how impossible it is by abstract metaphysical formulæ to do justice to concrete historical reality.

(5) The two words used for person, πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις next invite our attention. (i.) It is freely admitted even by the defenders of these creeds that the Greek philosophy from which the formulæ were drawn, had no adequate conception of personality, and that it is due to the influence of Christianity in invigorating the moral conscience and vitalizing the religious consciousness that the modern conception of personality is so much clearer and fuller. Ancient Philosophy was objective, it was concerned with the idea in the thing known; modern philosophy is subjective, it inquires about the subject knowing. We must keep this distinction constantly in view, as an inadequate conception of personality alone explains how it was possible for these thinkers to conceive two substances in one person unconfused and unchanged. (ii.) The term πρόσωπον means face, countenance, or expression of the face, appearance as regards condition or circumstance. In Sabellianism the term is applied to the three modes through which the divine unity passes. Father, Son, and Spirit are *masks* or *rôles* successively assumed by the one God. Nestorius, as well as the orthodox fathers who condemned him, used the term. 'When Nestorius insisted that he believed our Lord Jesus Christ, in His Godhead and His manhood to be "one *prosopon*," it was not that they

suspected the term *prosopon* of any hidden heretical meaning, but that they did not believe that he really believed what he said that he believed' (Bethune-Baker, p. 52). (iii.) But, it may be asked, why was he then suspected and condemned? It was because his use of the term *ὑπόστασις* was different. He declined to confess our hypostasis or a hypostatic union in Christ; and in his refusal he was justified by the older usage of the term, on which a new meaning had been put.

(a) 'To express the conception "substance" he used either of the two Greek synonyms *ousia* and *hypostasis*, the latter more frequently than the former' (Bethune-Baker, p. 49). 'Ousia is properly Platonic, while hypostasis, a comparatively modern and rare word, is properly Stoic' (Bigg, *The Christian Platonists*, p. 164). In using the term *ὑπόστασις* as = *οὐσία* he was entirely justified by its previous history. It means (1) 'that which settles at the bottom, sediment'; (2) 'anything set under, a support.' From this second meaning two metaphorical uses are derived, 'the groundwork or subject-matter of a thing,' and 'the foundation or ground of hope or confidence, confidence, resolution'; (3) 'subsistence, reality; substance, nature, essence.' From the time of Melito in the East and Tertullian in the West, two substances in the person of Christ had been affirmed. In the Anathemas attached to the Nicene Creed there is the phrase *ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας*, showing that the terms were then regarded as equivalent, and Athanasius in one of his later writings asserts their identical meaning.

(b) In the later decades of the fourth century, however, a new meaning had been imposed on the word *hypostasis* by some of the Greek theologians. They had come to use it as equivalent to *prosopon* for the three 'modes of existence' in the one substance of the Godhead; and this use had found general, but not universal, acceptance. Nestorius himself recognizes it. There is no distinct proof, however, that the term had been used for the person of Christ, as the unity of the Godhead and manhood.

(c) Even Cyril is not consistent in his use of the noun *hypostasis*, and the adjective *hypostatic*; and his translator Marius Mercator renders it sometimes 'substantia,' and sometimes 'subsistentia,' but never by the definite *persona*. Probably it served Cyril's purpose to use the ambiguous term, as his own mind wavered

between a unity of nature and a unity of person, for Eutyches believed himself to be following in the footsteps of Cyril in his monophysitism. Monophysites regarded *φύσις* as equal to *ὑπόστασις*, and so asserted one nature as well as person in Christ: identifying *φύσις* with *ὑπόστασις* in the Godhead, some of them landed in tritheism. 'If we regard this hypostatic union,' says Cyril (*τὴν καθ' ὑποστάσιν ἔνωσιν*), 'either as impossible or unmeet, we fall into the error of making two sons.' To avoid the duality of persons he assumes that the humanity was impersonal. 'Scripture does not say that the Word united to Himself the person (*πρόσωπον*) of a man, but that "he became flesh." But οὐκ ἔστι φύσις ἀνθρώπου—both Nestorius and Monophysites insisted. The Son unchanged 'became partaker of flesh and blood,' 'but even when taking to Himself flesh still remaining what He was.' These sentences would suggest that it was human body the divine Son assumed; but Cyril adds afterwards that 'the holy Body *was* endued with a rational soul' ('The Second Epistle to Nestorius' in *On Faith and the Creed*, pp. 100–101). Our psychology does not allow us, however, to conceive a rational soul that is not personal.

(d) Nestorius' objection to Cyril's view of the hypostatic union was that it involved a change and confusion of the divine and the human substance in Christ. The terms *hypostasis* and *ousia* ('subsistentia' and 'substantia'), originally identical in meaning, in course of time came to be used in the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ in different, and even inconsistent, senses. *Ousia* expresses the unity of the Godhead, and *hypostasis* the unity in the person of Christ. *Hypostasis* expresses the trinity in the Godhead, and *ousia* the duality in the person of Christ. In the one case we have three *hypostases* in one *ousia*; in the other two *ousiai* in one *hypostasis*.

(e) This discussion of the terms employed shows not only the injustice of the condemnation of Nestorius due to the ambition and rivalry of Cyril rather than to any real divergence from Christian truth; but even more the inadequacy of the metaphysical ideas and terms with which the Creeds attempt to define the nature of the Godhead and the person of Christ. If we attach exactly the same meaning to the word *ὑποστάσις* or *πρόσωπον*, 'subsistentia' or 'persona,' in the doctrine of the Trinity as in the doctrine of Christ, we deny the divine

unity. If we give exactly the same meaning to *οὐσία* or 'substantia' in the doctrine of Christ as in the doctrine of the Trinity, we deny the unity of His person. The Creeds maintain an unstable equilibrium between the unity and the duality of the person of Christ, Christian thought since has tended either towards Nestorianism in its common acceptance or to Eutychianism; Calvinism inclines

to the former, and Lutheranism to the latter. The Creed of Chalcedon was only an enforced truce; for it is through and through a theological compromise. A durable peace can be hoped for only, if not only the conclusions, but even the assumptions of the creeds are re-examined, and we can reach categories of thought more adequate to the reality to be interpreted.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Ready, aye Ready.

BY THE REV. JAMES RUTHERFORD, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'I am ready.'—ROM. i. 15.

THIS is the motto of one of our old Scottish families. Long ago one of our Scottish kings, James V., was about to advance against the English. He assembled his nobles at Fala, and none of them were willing to follow the Royal Standard with the single exception of Sir John Scott, who said he was ready to serve his king anywhere. King James was so pleased with the loyalty of Sir John Scott that he gave him the right to add a sheaf of spears to his coat of arms and this motto—a sheaf, a bunch of spears, representing a company of armed men, with this word—'Ready, aye Ready.'

If the Apostle Paul had a motto, I think it might have been something like this. In his letters and speeches you come again and again upon this word—'I am ready.' This was just the kind of man Paul was—a quick little man, swift, prompt, prepared, aye ready.

I want to give the motto to the boys and girls to-day. You have gone back to school: you are looking forward to the work of the session, and much farther forward to life. What a splendid thing if you really make this your motto and always say—'Ready!'

You may begin with it early in the morning. When that knock comes to the door, very aggravating it is on a dark winter morning, is this what you say as you jump up quickly—'I'm ready'; or do you say something else, or say nothing at all?

Then perhaps you will get into the habit of being ready; and it will help you all your life. If you

keep your eyes open, you will see that there are two kinds of boys—the quick boy and the slow boy. The quick boy has the best of it. Best at his lessons, best at his games. The quick eye, the ready hand, the swift foot—these count for something. And he is best too in life and the work of life when he comes to it.

When all the school-days are done, and the student-days, and the apprentice-days—when you come to the work of life, will you say—'I am ready'? School-days are days for getting ready, and it is a terrible thing to be pushed out to your work when you are not ready for it. Think of the medical student who shirked his work. Everybody wondered how he managed to get through his exams., but he did in a kind of way. Then he was sent to take somebody's practice in the country. One day he was called to a serious case miles away, and when he stood at the bedside he did not know what to do. He went home ashamed, to read up about it when it was too late—home like a beaten hound because he knew that if he had done his work as a student he would never have been helpless that day. Terrible it is to come to your work in life and say, 'Not prepared.'

It is God who gives us our work. Isaiah heard God in the Temple, and said, 'Here am I, send me.' Samuel, the little minister, heard God calling, and said, 'Speak, Lord; for thy servant heareth.' Paul at Damascus heard the voice from heaven, and said, 'What wilt thou have me to do?' They all said, 'Ready!' Our life is like that. Whatever our work may be, building houses or baking bread, writing books or printing books or selling books, a doctor's work or a minister's work, every day it is God who calls, and we should say, 'I am ready.'

Sometimes I wonder if there are any of our boys

and girls who will say what Paul said, 'I am ready to preach the gospel.' What was it that made Paul a missionary? It was a dream he had. One day Paul was at Troas. He did not know what to do, could not see where his work was to be. He went down to the shore to think about it, and sat down on the sand and looked out on the blue Mediterranean. Looking on the shimmering waters in the great heat of the sun, Paul fell asleep. Then in his dream the blue waters of the wide sea came

back; and away on the furthest horizon rose the figure of a man; and through the murmur of the waters came the cry, 'Come over and help us.' And Paul said, 'I am ready to preach the gospel.'

So as we look away beyond the seas and think of the millions of men and women and children who do not know what Christ has brought us, there is a voice crying, 'Come and tell us, teach us, help us.' And those who have the spirit of Paul say, 'I am ready to preach the gospel.'

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

The Second Part.

Vanity Fair.

THE passage concerning Vanity Fair is treated with more originality than we have had of late. They are housed there with Mnason, borrowed from that passage in *Ac* 21¹⁶, 'There went with us also certain of the disciples of Cæsarea and brought with them one Mnason of Cyprus, an old disciple, with whom we should lodge.' The Vanity Fair in which he had his lodging was that Jerusalem to which Paul was so determined to go, against his own safety. The passage and the men are transferred from the New Testament to the *Pilgrim's Progress*, not apparently from the desire to point any new moral, but rather as machinery for quite casual purposes of the narrative. While he lodges them, they discover that there are a few good people in the town of Vanity, just as there have always been saints in the wicked courts of Rome, France, and England. Honest at once desires to meet them, 'But how shall we do to see some of them, for the sight of good men to them that are going on pilgrimage is like the appearing of the moon and the stars to them that are sailing upon the seas.' So we have Contrite, Holy-man, Love-saint, Dare-not-lie, and Penitent invited to the lodging, an interesting counterpart to the list of the names of the jurymen in that same town. The voices of the good men are to the weary pilgrims a kind of sacrament of encouragement and bene-

diction. The conversation moves from point to point with a certain vivacity and freshness which keeps it interesting. The first point on which we may remark is that suggested by Contrite, who tells us that the Fair is so full of hurry as to make an *item* necessary, as a remembrancer for those that live in the midst of its bustle. Persecution it seems, has stopped, and religion is counted honourable in some parts of the town. Mr. Lecky is no doubt right when he assures us that persecution may be effective, and has often accomplished its purpose of stamping out the thing it hated. Yet human nature is such that after it has gone a certain length persecution becomes distasteful even to the cruel, and so stops itself. So we are told that after their departure when they came to the place where Faithful had been put to death 'they made a stand, and thanked Him that had enabled him to bear his cross so well; and they did so rather because they now found that they had benefited by such a man's sufferings, as his were.'

The best part of the conversation is Mr. Honest's delightful summary of the vicissitudes of pilgrimage, beginning with the sentence, 'It happeneth to us as it happeneth to wayfaring men.' There is a Christian stoicism and independence of fate and circumstances in that passage, not unworthy to be read with Shakespeare's:

Come what come may,
Time and the hour survive the roughest day.

or even with Dunbar :

Be merry, man, and tak not sair in mind
 The wavering of this wretchit world of sorrow ;
 To God be humble and to thy friend be kind,
 And with thy nichtbours gladly lend and borrow ;
 His chance to-nicht, it may be thine to-morrow ;
 Be blythe in heart for any adventure,
 For oft with wise men it has been said aforrow
 Without gladness availeth no treasure.

There is a good deal of general talk about pilgrimage, in which Holy-man insists upon courage and an unspotted life as the chief requisites for successful pilgrims, and Dare-not-lie, in a striking passage, describes those who are ill-dressed and careless, 'to the disparagement of their Lord.' Here is John Bunyan's old point of honour. The great motive for seemliness is the same as the motive for Holiness, and indeed for all other virtues, and it raises the ordinary decencies and good manners of life into the same high religious light as that which shines upon the noblest and most heroic virtues. The stay is prolonged, and they get to know many people of the Fair. The further marriages of Samuel and Joseph to two of Mnason's daughters, and the continual labour of Mercy among the poor, together with the coming of little children to the young married couples, more or less conventionalize the allegory. Along with this account of the prolonged stay in Vanity Fair, it is worth while to read Nathaniel Hawthorne's, and that of the pilgrim in Part Three, by way of contrast.

The most novel and curious feature of the whole narrative is the story of a monster that comes out of the woods and feeds upon young children. It is very difficult to tell what Bunyan had in his mind when he wrote this. Doubtless, the suggestion came ultimately out of old romances, such as those of St. George and the Dragon, or Beowulf and the Grendel. There seems to be some hidden meaning in it, which gives it a purpose further than that of breaking the monotony of the tale, for this monster had the habit of carrying off the children of the townsfolk and rearing them as its own, and it was governed by a woman. It has been supposed that some covert reference was made to the Great Plague in 1666, while, on the other hand, the Scarlet Woman might be suggested and the ravages of the Church of Rome upon the younger generation. Perhaps, however, it is simply some evil custom which Bunyan has in mind, such as drunkenness or the vanities of fashionable life, or

the lusts of the flesh. In any case, they did not kill the monster, but were able only to watch for him and continually assault him so that he became wounded and lame, and was unable to work so much havoc. Preaching and agitating and publicity lessen many evils which they cannot end, and this seems to be indicated in a general way here.

So it came to pass that even in Vanity Fair the Christians became popular with all but with some of the baser sort ; and the average citizens, though they 'wanted their taste of things, yet had a reverent esteem and respect for them.' It is, of course, common experience that the philanthropic side of a Christianity is often appreciated where there is no taste whatever for its spiritual aspect, but it says a great deal for John Bunyan that he remembered this and included it in his allegory. An evangelist less in touch with human nature would have been more uncompromising in his condemnation of the world of human life around him, and would have counted it dangerous to admit as much as Bunyan has done of natural virtue to the inhabitants of Vanity Fair. One remembers Thackeray's and Meredith's pictures of the world in their great novels, and the more we experience of life the less absolute becomes our judgment of worldly hearts. Even these citizens are not utterly bad people after all. Beneath all their folly and even cruelty, there are buried feelings of good, which can be and often have been awakened, and their daily life has in it many elements of simple human kindness and virtue which cannot be overlooked in forming a general estimate of things. Even when the pilgrims departed they left behind them in Vanity Fair, saints, as well as sinners.

The Further Journey.

For a time we are still glancing at the incidents and objects to which we were introduced in Part One. The Mine of Demas has no temptations or allurements for these pilgrims. They are rich enough for their necessities, and their travelling expenses are few, so that the temptation of lucre affects them only with astonishment, qualified by remembrance of the common fact of human nature, that people are generally little moved by the 'harms that others have met with, especially if that thing upon which they look has as an attract-

ing virtue upon the foolish eye.' With that commentary upon By-ends and Lot's Wife, they pass on their way.

The pastoral beauty of the riverside and the meadows leads to one of the most idyllic passages which Bunyan ever wrote, with its description of the children's home, and the man that gathered these lambs with His arm and carried them in His bosom. For human tenderness and exquisiteness of poetic feeling it will be difficult to surpass this great paragraph.

Doubting Castle.

Readers of Robert Louis Stevenson's essay on the *Pilgrim's Progress* will remember Miss Ennice Bagster's famous little woodcut of the demolition of Doubting Castle, in which we see the great keep split from top to bottom, and tumbling in a most monstrous ruin. This is the next incident to which the pilgrims come, and it is not approached without hesitation. The question is raised, whether it be right to venture upon the ground of Doubting Castle even for the purpose of demolishing it: and Great-heart, with characteristic daring, says that he feels that he has a commandment, and must run the risk. No such commandment, however, has been given to the women, nor to Feeble-mind, nor Ready-to-Halt. They do not involve themselves in this exploit further than to sit upon the road and keep guard there. 'All are safe, though so near to Doubting Castle. 'They keeping in the road a little child might lead them.' In this ingenious way Bunyan has touched upon a question which is vital in every age, and which is singularly appropriate in our own. Doubts are all around us, and there are some who are afraid to venture upon the ground, or to think about the questions which agitate their times at all.' It is a touch of fine spiritual genius that decides the question in each case as Bunyan does. The questions are there and earnest society always contains a religious clique of believers who stay safely in the road and take no part in the questions which perplex the growing number of their neighbours and their children. Thank God there are always others who feel that they have a commandment, and who are prepared to venture any risk that may befall them in regard to their own faith

if so be that they may rescue some of the persons of despair and the victims of doubt.

The story here becomes a most vivacious battle-piece. Giant Despair is clad in a breastplate of fire, like the Nessus-shirt of Heracles, and comes to meet them in all his formidable and terrifying strength. After a tough battle he is slain, and his wife, Diffidence, also perishes. It is significant that Diffidence is cut down by Honest. She stands for that habit of doubt to which reference has already been frequently made. It is not definite intellectual perplexities that are here intended, but a kind of lethargy and paralysis of faith. A greater champion than Honest is required to cut down Despair, who must be fought with the choicest spiritual and intellectual weapons of the Christian armoury. But the vague habit of unbelief is a thing which needs only honest treatment, for there is dishonesty and intellectual insincerity in entertaining doubts which one does not bring to a focus, and all that is needed in such cases is honesty to face the questions which in their vague uncertainty seems so much more formidable than they really are.

The ghastly picture of the victims of Despair is one which none who reads is likely to forget. How many dead are there!—the suicides and the dead souls of the centuries, whose memory must affect every thinking and compassionate spirit. Some, however, are not dead yet. Despondency almost starved to death, and Much-afraid, his daughter, are still not beyond the reach of salvation; and Bunyan is so glad about that that he lets his own merry human nature go, and gives us a dancing scene which contrasts very curiously with his own early scruples about bell ringing and such sports. Nothing could be more delicious than Christiana and Mercy playing upon the violin and the lute, and Mr. Ready-to-Halt, hand in hand with Despondency's daughter, dancing with his crutch, while the girl answers the music handsomely. Lest, however, any one should presume upon such hilarity, he feels it necessary to close this scene with a warning; and in the rather uncouth rhymes which he writes upon the marble stone, he hints that though Doubting Castle be demolished, and Giant Despair has lost his head, yet sin can rebuild the castle and Giant Despair can come to life again.

Literature.

THE PHILOCALIA OF ORIGEN.¹

IN view of the exceptionally fragmentary and imperfect form in which Origen's works have come down to us, all new light on the life and work of the great Alexandrian is especially welcome. Our best English guide on the subject is Westcott's exhaustive article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, along with his essay in *Religious Thought in the West*. There is an excellent essay in R. A. Vaughan's *Essays and Remains*. Origen's work *Against Celsus* and what is left of his *First Principles* are translated in the 'Ante-Nicene Library' (Clark). As far as we know, the work named above is the first English translation of a singularly interesting anthology of quotations from Origen drawn up by Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzus in the fourth century (a century after Origen). The quotations are selected from Origen's Homilies, Commentaries, and Treatises, some of which have since perished or survive only in the Latin version of Rufinus. The anthology is interesting as a proof that, despite the hatred which pursued Origen and his teaching even in his grave, he did not lack friends and admirers among the best Christian scholars. And still more it serves as a key to the tenor and spirit of his writings. Like Clement, his master, he represents the union between philosophy and faith for which Alexandria was famous, while English readers will have an opportunity of noting the sanity and sobriety of judgment which was often lacking in writers of the Alexandrian School.

An instance of the latter feature is the way in which he treats the allegorical method of which Alexandria was the home. We know the lengths to which this method was carried during the centuries of its reign. In the extracts given in the *Philocalia*, it is advocated as a means of explaining difficulties of style and matter both in the Old Testament and the New. The literal sense is often viewed merely as the vehicle of spiritual 'mysteries' or truths. Whether the primary sense is accepted or not is not always clear. We are not told what the higher truths are or how they are to be found.

¹ *The Philocalia of Origen*, translated into English by the Rev. George Lewis, M.A., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911. 8s. 6d. net.

In some instances there is a striking modernity in the explanations, as in reference to the Creation account. Still, whether we agree or not, we must recognize the serious purpose in view and the good sense with which it is worked out. Everything petty or ridiculous is conspicuously absent.

Another burning question—that of free will—is discussed repeatedly in the same practical way. The question was prominent in the East, and was more earnestly answered in the affirmative than in the West. The case on which argument against Scripture was based by Celsus and others was that of Pharaoh; and certainly, so far as the letter goes there is reason for the objection. Eschewing metaphysics, Origen argues by analogy and illustration. The objector believes, at least, that God is just; but if God punishes evil of which He is the cause, He is unjust, which is utterly contrary to Scripture. As the action of the sun varies with the substance it falls on, so God's goodness hardens where it does not persuade. As a physician does not always try to cure at first, but has to bring the malady to a head, so God must often indirectly aggravate the disease He seeks to remedy. It is a sign of Origen's mild and tolerant temper that He interprets the divine action as seeking even Pharaoh's good. 'The question, How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me? is intended to shame Pharaoh, because if he did not humble himself, it was not that he could not, but that he would not.' The difference in destiny is due to willingness or unwillingness in us. There is no need for God to harden the unwilling heart. To make God's foreknowledge the cause of what is foreknown is to reverse the real order.

It is no mean distinction that the analogy drawn by Origen between nature and Scripture in regard to the problems common to both proved the seed-corn of Butler's great treatise (p. 33).

The work includes a beautiful letter of Origen to Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neocæsarea, whom he addresses as 'my good lord and most reverend son.' He urges Gregory to treat science and philosophy as a preparation for Christianity, and ingeniously suggests that the spoils obtained by the Israelites from the Egyptians furnished the adornments for the first tabernacle of worship. In his reading of the divine Scriptures, Gregory is

to 'knock and seek in the right way and with unfaltering faith in God the meaning of the divine writings, which is hidden from the many. Be not content, however, with knocking and seeking; for prayer is the most necessary qualification for the understanding of divine things.'

Leeds.

J. S. BANKS.

CRISPI.

Nearly half a century has passed away since Garibaldi was received in this country with an enthusiasm never excited either before or since by the citizen of any foreign state. Probably no successful general in our own country, not even the great Duke himself, has aroused the feelings of our people as they were stirred by the presence in London of General Garibaldi, the liberator of Sicily and Naples.

In *The Memoirs of Francesco Crispi* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2 vols., 32s. net) we have the story of an exile from his native Sicily, who, along with Garibaldi, became one of the makers of modern Italy, and one of the earliest of her Prime Ministers.

Driven into exile while yet a young man, Francesco Crispi found it impossible to earn a living either in London or in Paris. But he did not despair either of his own future or of the future of his native land. He had the patriotic tide, that Burns tells us 'streamed through Wallace's undaunted heart.' He became one of 'the thousand' that sailed from Genoa, with Garibaldi at their head, to the relief of Sicily. 'Revolutions are not made with rose-water.' They need rifles and ammunition, and Garibaldi's expedition was not too well provided with either. But if ever 'gunpowder and glory' went together in doing good, it was in the outcome of what seemed a mad enterprise. Though Crispi was no soldier, yet he was one of Garibaldi's right-hand men in administration and diplomacy; and when the sword had done its work there was much diplomacy required, of which we have a full record in the first of these volumes. Thus the returned exile became one of the deliverers and saviours of his country. Crispi's dream was of a united Italy under Victor Emmanuel, and it was realized in 1871, when the overthrow of France in the Franco-German War left the Papal States with no defence against the Italian troops.

The second and more important of these volumes is entitled *The Triple Alliance*. It records what was once the secret history of the still existing

offensive and defensive alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy, in the formation of which Crispi played a leading part. The course of international diplomacy never did run smooth or straight, and its tortuous ways are clearly manifest in these pages. There was at first no love lost between Austria and Italy, and even Bismarck either would not, or could not, play his part as 'the honest broker' between them. We have here full and interesting records of Crispi's first interview with the German Chancellor, at which the alliance was frankly put forward. But Crispi was resolute that Austria must not have Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Bismarck was as decided that it was no part of his business to mention the subject to Austria. He proffered the suggestion that Italy might have another slice of Turkey. The result was that Austria got all she wanted, and Italy got nothing. Curiously enough, some years later, when France had decided to seize Tunis, and Crispi was protesting in every quarter, it was Lord Salisbury who said she might have Tripoli if only she would wait, and now Italy is waging war against Turkey for the territory she was 'offered' long ago.

There is an interesting narrative of Crispi's visit to Bismarck in his own home in 1887. The Italian statesman wrote in the German Chancellor's album: 'In this sanctuary of patriotism, where vigil is kept for the maintenance of the peace of Europe, I leave a memory.' We are told that this thought gave much satisfaction to the Prince, who said in a serious tone: 'Your Excellency has read my intentions aright. I labour for the maintenance of peace. I live for that alone. We have done enough for war; now let us work together for peace.' It was on the same occasion that this man of peace, speculating on the probability of war between Russia and Germany, took comfort in the fact that Germany could put three millions of soldiers in the field, and had arms, uniforms, and everything necessary for them. He did not live to see and did not foresee Russia stricken and smitten in the Far East and her fleet destroyed in the Sea of Japan. Signor Crispi was not far wrong in saying that a year and half is longer than any one can see ahead in the tortuous courses of diplomacy.

SWIFT'S CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. F. Elrington Ball, Litt.D., has now issued the third and last volume of his edition of *The*

Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D. (G. Bell & Sons; 3 vols., 8vo, 10s. 6d. net each). It is a surprise in literature. For this edition was undertaken by one man and carried out by another, yet it is the best edition of Swift's Correspondence. It was undertaken by Mr. Caesar Litton Falkner, who was known to be well furnished for the purpose; and it was carried out, on his death, by Mr. Elrington Ball, who had to prove his capacity for it; and yet it is not only the best edition of Swift's Correspondence, but such an edition as is likely to remain the standard for all time to come.

'Besides a very great increase in the Correspondence, a comparison of the present edition with that of Sir Walter Scott will show that there are few letters included in his edition which appear in this one without some alteration. As will be seen from the frequency with which his name is quoted as the authority, Sheridan has been found the editor whose work evinces the greatest care, and there is reason to think that he had means no longer in existence of correcting the text given by his predecessors. The most extraordinary view of the duties of an editor was taken by Faulkner, and solecisms, which Sheridan noticed and corrected, arose not infrequently from Faulkner's confidence that he could improve what came from even the pen of Swift. For instance, the use in the third person singular of verbs of the termination *th*, to which Sheridan calls attention, is not generally found in Swift's autograph letters, and appears to have been due to Faulkner.'

After mentioning the sources, six in all, which have been used to correct and augment the previous editions, the editor says: 'The present edition is the first in which any extensive annotation has been attempted. Faulkner and Hawkesworth dropped here and there a note containing an observation of a most obvious kind, or information that would be known to almost any reader. Sheridan inserted pedantic criticisms of Swift's grammar and construction. Nichols added only such knowledge as he had gained in the compilation of his noble "History of Leicestershire," and Sir Walter Scott is responsible for some platitudes which there is good ground to believe were the work of an assistant. But this failure to explain the references in the letters is at least as much attributable to inability as to reluctance to undertake the toil. Apart from the countless books which the press of to-day brings to their aid,

workers in the present age are too apt to forget that to their predecessors the Public Record Offices of England and Ireland, and the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, were not even a dream.'

Swift's continued popularity is due to several causes. They are admirably described in the Introduction to the first volume. That Introduction has been written by the Bishop of Ossory, Dr. J. H. Bernard, who, when himself Dean of St. Patrick's, did so much for the study of Swift and for the solution of the controversies that have gathered round his name. Two things Dr. Bernard lays special emphasis upon—Swift's sincerity and Swift's style. And the present generation will seek no other reason.

With this issue of the Correspondence, there are now satisfactory editions of all Swift's works. For already we have received from the same publishers Temple Scott's edition of the Prose Works in twelve volumes, and Ernst Browning's edition of the Poems in two volumes. These are in small post 8vo, and no doubt the Correspondence will appear in that form in process of time. But in the meantime this is the only edition, and it can never be quite superseded. For its illustrations, were there nothing else, will always give it unique value.

A Chronicle of the Popes (Bell & Sons; 7s. 6d. net). How have we been able to get along without it? By laboriously working through Ranke, Creighton, Luchaire, and all the rest of the books which contain the history of *some* of the Popes; or else by yet more laboriously consulting the Dictionaries and Encyclopædias on each of the Popes by name. This is a Chronicle of all the Popes from St. Peter (if he was a Pope) to Pius x., in one handy volume. And Mr. A. E. McKilliam, the author of the book, has contrived to make it a readable record. Pope after Pope stands before us in his individuality as each short chapter is read. And that is the greater achievement inasmuch as this is not a biographical but an historical work. The Popes are here; here also are their acts; and here in some measure are the causes and the consequences of them and of their acts.

It is not very long since there was published a good introduction to the study of ballads, by Professor Gummiere. The success of that book has

encouraged the editors of the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature' to include in their series a shorter but not less attractive or authoritative introduction by Mr. T. F. Henderson. The title is *The Ballad in Literature* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 1s. net).

Captain F. W. O. Maycock, D.S.O., whose volume on *Napoleon's European Campaigns* came as a surprise of clever condensation, has now issued a fuller account of *The Napoleonic Campaign of 1805* (Gale & Polden; 3s. 6d. net). The book is well furnished with maps, which it will not often be necessary to consult, so clear is the narrative throughout.

The Rev. Augustus Hopkins Strong, D.D., LL.D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary, U.S.A., has been teaching in that seminary for forty years. Besides his lectures, he has delivered many addresses and sermons during that time, and he has written many essays. All these addresses, sermons, and essays—or at least all that he thought worth preserving—he has gathered together now and published in two large handsome volumes, of five hundred octavo pages each, under the title of *Miscellanies* (Philadelphia, The Griffith & Rowland Press; \$1 each).

The first volume, he says, is 'chiefly historical.' Perhaps it is. There are at any rate historical addresses in it, and even historical sermons. There is an address on the future of the Baptists in America, under the title of 'Our Denominational Outlook'; and there is a sermon on the past of the Baptists in America, under the title of 'Our Fathers' Faith and its Lessons for To-day.' But there are also addresses on 'Theology and Literature,' on 'The Element of Justice in War,' on 'The Omnipresent Christ,' and on 'Timelessness in Man and in God.' Are they historical? Nor altogether historical, though there is history in them, are the papers read to various clubs on 'The Roman Wall in Britain,' 'The Châteaux of France,' and 'Rome, Old and New.' But all these sermons, addresses, and papers serve one and the same purpose. They show that the President of the Rochester Theological Seminary has many interests, and can write with interest on them all. Whatever you say about the opinions of President Strong, you always say that he makes you listen to him.

The second volume, he tells us, is 'chiefly theological.' It is, in fact, a volume of sermons. There are three articles or lectures to begin with—on Schleiermacher, Ezekiel Gilman Robinson, and Degeneration; and there are thirteen very short addresses to end with; but the rest are sermons.

And the sermons are the best of the volumes and will be the life of them. The rest, being mostly mundane knowledge, will vanish away. But the sermons will remain. For, while they are as literary as the addresses, and their message is sent home by a well-chosen incident or poem, that message is always the Cross of Christ, the power of God unto salvation.

Under the title of *The Greatest English Classic*, Dr. Cleland Boyd McAfee has published a study of the Authorized Version (Harper). Dr. McAfee is full of enthusiasm for the 'King James Version,' as he calls it, but his book scarcely deserves the name of study. No doubt it is purposely written in a popular style. It was originally delivered as a series of popular lectures at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. But popularity is no proper synonym for inaccuracy. On the contrary, the less opportunity our readers have of testing our statements, the more careful we should be in making them. But it must be confessed that Dr. McAfee is often very loose, sometimes incredibly inaccurate. He explains the phrase 'all to break his skull' in this way. 'When the King James translators wrote that, they used the word "alto," which is evidently the beginning of "altogether," or wholly or utterly, and what they meant was that she threw the stone and utterly broke his skull.' Certainly that was what they meant, but that is not how they obtained their meaning.

The Rev. L. MacLean Watt, M.A., B.D., has prepared an order of service for Presbyterian Churches, and called it *The Minister's Manual* (Edinburgh: Henderson; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published *An Index to Expositions of Holy Scripture*, by Alexander Maclaren, D.D., LL.D. (7s. 6d.). The compiler is the Rev. George Eayrs, F.R.Hist.S. It is a surprise to find the texts mixed up with the subjects; it would have been more convenient if they had been arranged separately. Otherwise

everything seems in order. The volume has been printed and bound in uniformity with the series.

A volume of addresses to children, written by the Rev. Frederick Humphrey, has been published by Messrs. Hunter & Longhurst (1s. 6d. net). As the title is *Pins and Needles*, it is proper to say that the addresses are pointed. They are also short and very unconventional.

Deuteronomy: Its Place in Revelation, is the title of a volume by the Rev. A. H. McNeile, D.D., Fellow and Dean of Sidney-Sussex College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). Last year the S.P.C.K. published a book by the Rev. J. S. Griffiths under the title of *The Problem of Deuteronomy*. Dr. McNeile's volume is an answer to that book. It is an effective answer, the more effective that it is so forbearing. For example: In order to prove that Deuteronomy is the work of Moses, Mr. Griffiths asserts that it contains many archaic expressions. His words are, it 'abounds in archaisms.' Whereupon he abbreviates a list of its archaisms which he found in the *Pulpit Commentary* on Deuteronomy. Now the *Pulpit Commentary* took its list from Delitzsch's *Commentary on Genesis*, using the fourth edition, which appeared in 1872. But in his *New Commentary on Genesis*, published in 1887, Delitzsch abandoned the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, and with it his entire list of archaisms, with one single exception.

But Dr. McNeile's volume is more than an answer to Mr. Griffiths. Professor Driver, who writes a 'Foreword' to it, says that it 'contains a lucid exposition of the contents and scope of Deuteronomy, and of the place taken by it in the history of revelation.' And this is at present the very best service that any book could render us.

Mr. Leighton Pullan, Fellow and Tutor of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford, has contributed to the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology' a volume on *The Gospels* (Longmans; 5s.). The volume has in its favour the attractive outward appearance which has given distinction to the series, and it may need that advantage in order to give it a start. For we have had very many books on the Gospels within the last year or two, and some of them are very good books. This, however, is in our opinion the best book that Mr.

Pullan has written, and it will take its place among the best books that have been written on the Gospels.

The author's critical position will be understood if we say that it is practically that of Dr. Sanday. Dr. Sanday's influence is felt throughout the book. But that is not to say that it is an influence which has in any degree repressed the author's own individuality. On the contrary, it has stimulated it. This, indeed, is the effect of Dr. Sanday's influence always, so open is he himself to every ray of light that may come, no matter what quarter it comes from. There are one or two slight inaccuracies, which will have to be attended to when a second edition is called for.

Either you must buy all the books of the late Professor William James or else you must buy none of them. For they are inseparably connected with one another by cross-references. It is that system of cross-references that has compelled—yes, compelled—the publication of another book. Thus in *The Meaning of Truth* (p. 127), he says, 'This statement is probably excessively obscure to any one who has not read my two articles "Does Consciousness Exist?" and "A World of Pure Experience."' The reader who turned to find these two articles could not find them; they had never been published. They have been published now, together with other ten articles, under the title of *Essays in Radical Empiricism* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net).

But there is another reason for the publication of this book. Professor James was both a Pragmatist and a Radical Empiricist. And these two things, he said himself, were wholly independent of one another. 'Let me say that there is no logical connexion between pragmatism, as I understand it, and a doctrine which I have recently set forth as "radical empiricism." The latter stands on its own feet.' Now we know where to find William James the pragmatist. The radical empiricist can be found, if found at all, in this book.

May we know what radical empiricism is? We may at least read what Professor James himself says it is. 'I say "empiricism," because it is contented to regard its most assured conclusions concerning matters of fact as hypotheses liable to modification in the course of future experience; and I say "radical," because it treats the doctrine of monism itself as an hypothesis, and, unlike so

much of the half-way empiricism that is current under the name of positivism or agnosticism or scientific naturalism, it does not dogmatically affirm monism as something with which all experience has got to square.'

A short memorial of *Herbert Kynaston*, at one time Headmaster of Cheltenham College, has been written by the Rev. E. D. Stone (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). Short as it is, even very short, it gives one quite a good account of a man who was a man indeed, earnest and sincere. The selections that have been made from his occasional writings, light and humorous as they mostly are, do not blur but fill in the picture. Take this contribution to a vexed question:

DEBÓRAH v. DÉBORAH

Our J.T.F. pronounces it Debórah,
For those who call her Déborah a floorer;
And, to regard the Hebrew points as he doth,
Should not her husband's name be called
Lapidoth?

Mr. Percy S. P. Handcock, M.A., has found a new use for 'that blessed word Mesopotamia.' He has written an Introduction to the Archæology of Babylonia and Assyria, and, feeling the awkwardness of using two names for one stretch of country, he has called his book *Mesopotamian Archæology* (Macmillan; 8vo, pp. xvi + 423, 12s. 6d. net). The book is furnished with a coloured frontispiece, 32 plates in half-tone, and many illustrations in line, together with two maps on one sheet.

Well, it is not the first book that Sir Henry Layard has been the occasion of. His own fascinating volumes are fascinating still. And they have been the quarry for many a popular book which followed them. But there has been much discovery in the Mesopotamian plain since Layard, as Hilprecht has already made us know. Mr. Handcock is not the first, but he is the latest, and being latest he has gathered together all that the spades of his predecessors brought to light and has arranged it in sections, showing a complete mastery of the material, together with great skilfulness in its description.

The discoveries in Babylonia and Assyria have obtained their reputation from their association with the Bible. The student of the Bible knows

how intense is the interest to be found in them. But he has never realized how enormous is the mass of material now available for the use of the historian and the antiquarian. There are few departments of knowledge that are left unvisited. Architecture, Sculpture, Metallurgy, Painting, Engraving, Pottery, Dress—each has a chapter of its own, with many illustrations; and besides these there is one long chapter under the comprehensive title of 'Life, Manners, Customs, Law, Religion.' The book ends with a short bibliography, a list of kings and rulers, and a serviceable index.

Under the auspices of the Methodist Branch of the Laymen's Missionary Movement in Victoria, a volume has been published which contains a history of the work already accomplished for Christ in the islands of the Pacific, its present position, and its future prospects. This opportune service has been rendered by the Rev. J. W. Burton of Fiji. It is a small book, but it is packed with well-mastered information. From its clever title, *The Call of the Pacific* (2s. net), to its comprehensive map, everything is workmanlike.

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier are the publishers of a volume of services for public worship, sacramental and other occasions, which has been prepared by the Rev. Hugh George Watt, D.D. The title is *The Sacraments and Prayer* (2s. 6d. net).

The easy-going argument for Christian Science is that 'there must be something in it.' The Rev. T. H. Wright, of the Church of Scotland in Dresden, has studied the whole subject and he can find nothing in it. His little book, *Christian Science: Its Teaching and Practice in the Light of Christianity* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s. net), is from beginning to end an astonished and astonishing exposition of mental confusion and moral impotence.

Mr. F. W. Grant has written a book on *Genesis in the Light of the New Testament* (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net). It is only in the light of the New Testament that we can ever look at Genesis now, but Mr. Grant does so deliberately and absorbingly, not being the least afraid to find prophecy in the one and fulfilment in the other.

The same publishers have issued a second edition of Mr. Ernest Dowsett's little book *The Women who walked with Jesus* (1s. net).

A volume of daily readings from the works of the Rev. J. R. Miller, D.D., has been issued from the Pilgrim Press. Its title is *The Shining Life* (2s. 6d. net).

From the Pilgrim Press there comes also 'a scheme of lessons correlating civics with religious instruction,' under the title of *Good Citizenship* (1s. 6d. net). The author is Mr. W. D. Bavin. It is the application to a special topic of Mr. Bavin's very practical method of imparting instruction, a method which has been tested by long personal experience.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians has been edited for Mr. Buckland's 'Devotional Commentary,' by Canon R. B. Girdlestone (R.T.S.; 2s.). In respect of criticism Canon Girdlestone follows Sir William Ramsay. But criticism is not understood to enter much into this series. It is a devotional commentary, and to Canon Girdlestone at any rate, 'devotional' is practically equivalent to 'expository and evangelical.'

Mr. Edward A. Marshall has written a story founded on the Book of Jonah. It is quite a good example of this kind of fiction, which never has been or can be altogether successful. But Mr. Marshall is fortunate in having a wife who can illustrate his book, and by her illustrations lift it clean out of the ordinary and the commonplace. The title is *Jonah of Gath-Hepher* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

Professor Herbert L. Willett of the University of Chicago has published a volume of sermons to which he has given the title *The Call of the Christ* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). The complaint is made of some preachers that they never mention Christ. Professor Willett never mentions anything else. The name is found in the title of every one of the sermons. The first sermon is called 'The Audacity of Christ'; the second 'The Call of the Christ' (that sermon giving its title to the book); the third is called 'The Authority of Christ'; and so we pass to the last three, which are 'The Patriotism of Christ,' 'The Uniqueness of Christ,' and 'The Perennial Christ.' What is Professor Willett's

attitude to Christ? It is the attitude of love, the love of a scholar who has been redeemed with His precious blood.

If you read the *Pacific Monthly* or the *North American Review*, you know the name of Kiyoshi K. Kawakami. For in these periodicals Mr. Kawakami has recently had some articles. And if the name did not arrest your attention, the articles were bound to do so. Mr. Kawakami is greatly concerned about the cool relations that now exist between Japan and America. He believes that this coolness is due to misunderstanding. The misunderstanding has arisen over three different questions: The Manchuria question, the Korean question, and the emigration question. He believes that on all these questions Americans have misunderstood the aims of Japan and misinterpreted her actions; and he wrote these articles, which, along with some others, he has now gathered into a handsome volume, for the purpose of showing the Americans that they are in the wrong. 'It is time that America should conduct herself in a manner that becomes the power, wealth, and culture that inhere in her. It is time that Americans should awaken to the grave situation which cannot fail to result if they persist in playing the rôle of a *provocateur*—unless, forsooth, they are really anxious to create a *casus belli*. These are plain words, but I say them in the name of international deportment, peace and amity.' The title of the book is *American-Japanese Relations* (Revell; 7s. 6d. net).

On the whole, one is struck with the fairness of Mr. Kawakami's defence of his country. He admits, for example, that the Japanese did not always treat the natives of Korea well at the beginning of the Japanese occupation. 'Many adventurers and speculators and other undesirable characters came to the peninsula from Japan, all expecting to fish in troubled waters. The worst of these people were, perhaps, money-lenders and low-class laborers. The natural thriftlessness of the Koreans, coupled with a childish pride in actually possessing large sums of money, furnished eminently suitable traits upon which the unscrupulous usurer could build a thriving business. His favourite method was to loan money upon rice-fields in sums much below the actual value of the land. These loans bore high interest and were made for short periods; when the debtor failed to

pay on the fixed date, the creditor lost no time in foreclosing the mortgage.

'Not less reprehensible was the conduct of low-class laborers. Puffed up by the notion that their country vanquished one of the greatest military powers of Europe, they vented their arrogance and their contempt for the Koreans by bullying and bluster. They apparently believed that they were, by right of conquest, entitled to handle their native neighbours as they pleased. It never dawned upon them that their acts were calculated to hinder the good work of the residency-general by alienating the sympathy of the natives as well as of foreign nations. Had it not been for the detestable conduct of this riffraff, Japanese rule in Korea would not have been made the target of scathing criticisms.'

Whether or not there is in this country any widespread interest in the mysteries, or in any kind of esoteric knowledge, will be put to the test by the publication in English of Edouard Schuré's great work. The book now published in two volumes in an English translation by Mr. Fred Rothwell, B.A., under the title of *The Great Initiates* (Rider; 7s. 6d. net), has been appearing in fragments during the last seven years. And on the whole it is good for its reputation that it has appeared so. For the subject is off the ordinary lines either of youthful education or of adult interest; and to accept it or even to understand it takes some time and patience and some collateral reading. If one were simply in a hurry to find out whether there is anything in it, or to confirm an already formed opinion that there is nothing in it, one should begin with the last division, which is entitled 'Jesus, the Last Great Initiate.' It does not seem at all likely that one who reads that division first will read any more of the book. But it is not certain that that method will be fair to the author or even to oneself. Initiation into mysteries occupies a very large place in the history of the religion of the world, and is in itself a subject demanding reverent and patient study. It is therefore not altogether impossible that some progress in that study might furnish even the student of the Gospels with the means of discovering elements in the life and person of Jesus that are true though otherwise undetected. Let us begin, therefore, with the introductory chapter on 'Esoteric Teaching,' and from that pass through Rama, Krishna, Hermes, Moses,

Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, and so come at last to Jesus.

Professor Arthur Drews, Ph.D., of Carlsruhe, has gained for himself quite a name, however long it may last him, by denying the historical existence of Jesus, and has reached the glory of having his books translated into English. The latest translation is made by Mr. Joseph McCabe; the title of the book in English is *The Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus* (Watts; 6s. net).

How does a man with such a task before him go to work? One of the things that appeal to him is the fact that Jesus has left no personal writings behind Him. 'As to the existence of Luther, Frederick the Great, Goethe, or Bismarck, we have not only documents from their own hand, the genuineness of which is not open to question, but masses of evidence on the part of contemporaries. All this is wanting in the case of Jesus. He has not left behind a single line. He has, as Jülicher says, "written in the sand," and there is not a single reliable document to enable us to trust the gospels, from which alone we learn something about his life. It is, therefore, just as permissible to doubt as to admit the existence of such a person; and it is an unhappy indication of the superficiality and loose thinking of our time that even leaders of science have not hesitated to bring into the field to prove the historicity of Jesus this foolish reference to historical personalities.' One thinks here of Socrates, who also 'has not left behind a single line.' Does Professor Drews deny *his* existence?

But, now, notice in that quotation the phrase 'the gospels, from which alone we learn something about his life.' Do we learn nothing whatever from the Epistles? Professor Drews disposes of the Epistles in the same way as he disposes of the Gospels. There is, for example, that very important passage in 1 Co 11²³, which tells of the institution of the Eucharist. What will Professor Drews do with that? He will simply use with it the same argument as he finds successful in every other instance in which an historical fact or statement stands in his way. He will not bring forward other facts or statements which are opposed to it; he will simply argue on *a priori* grounds that it cannot possibly be true. After asserting that 'the mysticism of the festive supper cannot have been instituted by Jesus, but is based on the cult of the Christian community, and was subsequently put in

the mouth of its supposed founder,' he proceeds to 'examine the passage more closely.' This is how he proceeds—

"The same night in which he was betrayed"—*was* he betrayed? The thing is historically so improbable, the whole story of the betrayal is so absurd historically and psychologically, that only a few thoughtless Bible-readers can accept it with complacency. Imagine the ideal man Jesus knowing that one of his disciples is about to betray him and thus forfeit his eternal salvation, yet doing nothing to restrain the miserable man, but rather confirming him in it! Imagine a Judas demanding money from the high-priest for the betrayal of a man who walks the streets of Jerusalem daily, and whose sojourn at night could assuredly be discovered without any treachery! "For Judas to have betrayed Jesus," Kautsky says, "is much the same as if the Berlin police were to pay a spy to point out to them the man named Bebel." Moreover, the Greek word *paradidonai* does not mean "betray" at all, but "give up," and is simply taken from Is 53¹², where it is said that the servant of God "gave himself unto death." The whole story of the betrayal is a late invention founded on that passage in the prophet, and Judas is not an historical personality, but, as Robertson believes, a representative of the Jewish people, hated by the Christians, who were believed to have caused the death of the Saviour. Further, the "night," in which the betrayal is supposed to have taken place, has no historical background. It merely serves to set in contrast the luminous figure of Jesus and the dark work of his betrayer. Hence Paul cannot have known anything of a nocturnal betrayal on the part of Judas, and one more "proof" of the historicity of Jesus breaks down.

Sir Harry Johnston's new book is like a haggis,

somewhat confused feeding. A little patience, however, brings method out of the apparent chaos. Sir Harry Johnston is an anthropologist, and his interest is not in individuals but in races. The book is accordingly found to contain a series of anthropological studies in race development, three races being specially chosen for study—the Irish, the German, and the North African. The title of the book is *Views and Reviews* (Williams & Norgate; 3s. 6d. net).

There has been a good deal of discussion lately about the Pharisees. Jewish scholars, especially those of the liberal school of Mr. Montefiore, have charged the New Testament writers with misinterpretation, and their charge has been listened to by Christian scholars with patience and sometimes with considerable sympathy. And now at last a book entitled *Pharisaism* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net) has been written by Mr. R. Travers Herford, B.A., which goes beyond anything yet attempted in the way of sympathy with the Jewish complaint. It is not an easy matter to deal with, and Mr. Herford has not found it so. He is not, however, so much troubled as some of us would be with that which is the central difficulty. For to him, to whom Jesus is 'simply the greatest man who ever lived,' it is not at all inconceivable that the Pharisees might have been treated unfairly even by our Lord Himself. His own opinion, indeed, is that Jesus 'having in effect broken with the religion of Torah, and being in the position of a man driven to bay, fighting, as the saying is, with His back against the wall, it is only human nature that He should so speak as to hit hard.' The conclusion he comes to, accordingly, is that the Pharisees on the whole are misrepresented in the New Testament, that they were better men, and practised a better religion, than the New Testament leads us to believe.

The Gospel of Hosea.

By REV. JAMES STRAHAN, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'For I am God, and not man.'—Hos. xi. 9.

HOSEA was one of the most beautiful souls that has ever lived and suffered in our earth. The most ethereal of the prophets, he seems like a spirit from a better world, radiating a pure heavenly light amid

the dark shadows of time. In the whole gallery of Old Testament portraits there is no more fascinating figure than that of the prophet of Divine and human love. If he had not been an inspired teacher, he might have been a great lyric

poet. One of the first, he was also one of the noblest of the not very large family of the mystics, who dare to make their own thoughts, feelings, and actions the norm of divinity. Mysticism has been defined by Vaughan, in his somewhat unsympathetic *Hours with the Mystics*, as 'that form of error which mistakes for a Divine manifestation the operations of a merely human faculty.' This hard saying surely applies only to the lower, and fails to take account of the higher, forms of mysticism. It can scarcely be doubted that certain human minds have had a wonderful affinity with the Divine mind. The light that has been in them has not been darkness, and if we are to understand such mysticism as theirs, we must rather begin by doing justice to that fine Hebrew saying, 'The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord.' With Plato and Plotinus, the Hebrew and the Christian mystic take the things of time and sense for mirrors or symbols of eternal heavenly realities, and they can no more doubt their intuitions of God than they can doubt their own existence. It is true that even the purest human mind has never—except once—been an absolutely perfect medium for the transmission of the white radiance of eternity; and few confessions are more pathetic than that of Savonarola, the prophet-mystic of Florence, 'I count as nothing: darkness encompasses me: *yet the light I saw was the light from heaven.*' No doubt it was; and this inward illumination is the distinction of the true mystic. The very keenness of the self-scrutiny and self-blame of these great and humble souls makes us the readier to admit the essential validity of their unfaltering claims to Divine insight, and we shall find how little the light of heaven was either distorted or discoloured as it passed through the mind of the prophet of Ephraim.

It is characteristic of the mystic that he does not need to stray from home in quest of the Divine secret. Hosea received his message neither in the solitude of the desert, nor in the society of other prophets. Rather the truth met him at his own threshold, revealed herself to him there, and summoned him thence to his life-work. Other prophets might come down from the mountains or up from the wilderness to thunder the word of the Lord in the ear of the nation, but there is no indication that Hosea ever wandered, or wished to wander, from the valleys and meadows, the orchards and vineyards, of his much-loved Ephraim.

There never was a truer patriot. The concentration of his thoughts is evidenced by the fact that while Ephraim is always on his lips—it occurs thirty-six times in his prophecy—he never once names Jerusalem, and all the references to Judah seem to be interpolations made by the Judean hands through which his work has passed. Too individual and original to owe much to other minds, he never affected the manners or felt the contagious influence of 'the sons of the prophets,' probably never wore the picturesque prophetic mantle of dark haircloth, and never had any connexion with the guilds of prophets who led a cœnobitic life and fanned each other's religious enthusiasm with the breath of music and song. Nor was he conscious of any temperamental affinity with the fanatical Nazirites and Rechabites—true descendants of the desert Bedouin—who had a quarrel with civilization as such, for how could he doubt that 'the corn, wine and oil, the silver and gold' were gifts of God? He was rather a man of the people, attempting, in an age of material splendour and spiritual decay, to live a common life well. Sensitive, poetic, imaginative, pensive, with far more than an ordinary capacity alike for joy and sorrow, he was intensely alive to the quiet beauty of nature, the peacefulness of home, the sanctities and fidelities of love. With such a common life he would have been well content. But God had other thoughts regarding him, and higher work for him to do, calling him to be one of the greatest religious teachers the world has ever seen.

True mystic that he was, Hosea recognized that his gospel was inseparable from his personality. Had he not felt that some indication of the development of his mind was an essential part of his message, he would never have written his poignant prelude. He perceived that the doctrine could not be understood without the personal illustration; the Divine archetype was only to be seen through the human type. There is an apparent egoism in the mystic which is compatible with a very real and profound humility. Indeed, his task of speaking of himself is sometimes the heaviest of crosses. Hosea would never have given his *confessio amantis* to a cold and critical world if he had not felt himself in the grip of an overmastering necessity. Wild horses would never have dragged the tale from him, but the hand of the Lord was upon him, and he could not choose but speak.

With touching reserve, in a quiet historical style which is yet tremulous with feeling and infinitely more moving than floods of impassioned rhetoric, he tells the story of his heart, not because he wishes to attract any attention to himself, but because he has so much to say of the Sacred Heart which beats at the centre of all things. Through an outer portal he will lead us into the temple's inner shrine. He has found that the Divine and the human secret of existence are one; they have both revealed themselves to him at the flaming core of an ordinary life.

The transfiguration of the common human lot, which henceforth shines with a radiance from heaven, is ever the most thrilling and wonderful of experiences. Suggestions of this more than magical change may be noted in external nature. 'The House Beautiful' is only 'a naked house' on 'a naked moor':

Yet shall your ragged moor receive
The incomparable pomp of eve.

It is the task of the artist to open our eyes to the glory of 'things we have passed a hundred times nor cared to see,' till it begins to dawn upon us that 'every common bush' is 'afire with God.' But it is from the hidden depths of the human soul, touched by a light from heaven, that life itself catches a splendour which never again fades away.

There were two days of Hosea's life in which the gates of reality finally opened to him. The one was the day in which he declared his love, the other the day in which he was disillusioned. It was the second of these days—when his Eden was withered, and naught remained but 'bare ruined quires where late the sweet birds sang'; when his temple was in ruins, the shrine empty, the holy of holies desecrated—that really tested him. The ordeal to such a nature as his was the severest imaginable, the pain too exquisite for words, the sense of wrong too deep for tears. From his seven times heated furnace, how did he emerge? How did he take up the task of life again? Did he merely laugh a bitter laugh and turn to seek other pleasures? Did he live to write a dreary little 'Vanitas Vanitatum.' Did he anticipate the cynic of his race who set his seal to the insulting dictum, 'One type of manhood among a thousand have I found, but an ideal of womanhood among all these have I not found'?

If that had been the end of it, we should never have heard of him and his story. He would have had no gospel for Israel and mankind. But when the first anguish of disillusionment was past, he came out of the depths not merely with the peace of an accepted sorrow, but with the awakened consciousness that love is love for ever. 'Love is not love which alters when it alteration finds. . . . It hath the quality of everlastingness.' One cannot but wonder if the prophet knew those words, first heard somewhere among the hills and vales of Ephraim, and more fervent than any ever breathed by the burning lips of Sappho:

For love is strong as death. . . .
The flashes thereof are flashes of fire,
A very flame of the Lord.
Many waters cannot quench love
Neither can the floods drown it.

At any rate the truth that love is unquenchable was the keynote of the prophet's whole after life. Love was evermore his Lord and king, who could not be defeated or discrowned. Therefore we find him ordering all the rest of his days on the calm assumption that love must triumph. We see him always in the attitude of intensely eager, but perfectly assured, waiting. We watch his love bearing all things, believing all things, hoping all things, enduring all things, and never failing. It is patient because eternal. Just when it appears to have received its death-blow, it proves itself to be deathless, a truth which is the burden of perhaps the finest sonnet in the English language:

Now at the last gasp of Love's latest breath,
When, his pulse failing, Passion speechless lies,
When Faith is kneeling at his bed of death
And Innocence is closing up his eyes,
Now if thou would'st, when all have given him over,
From death to life thou might'st him yet recover.

Now, as is the man, such is his gospel. There never was a clearer illustration of the principle that the heart makes the theologian. With the uttermost daring of a simple faith, Hosea makes his own mind an index of the Mind of Deity. It is true, he might have done the same if he had been hard and unforgiving; he might have done the same if he had set his face like a flint, and determined simply to be just; he might have done the same if thoughts of repudiation and reprobation had barred out all other thoughts. But in that case he would have had no gospel, he would simply have been one more stern censor of sin and preacher of righteous-

ness. It was his conduct in the supreme moral crisis of his life that made his mind like a sensitized plate ready to receive a new image of God. His own forgiving pity, his own redeeming love, won for him a sudden vision of the great Heart of the Eternal. From that hour he knew that inextinguishable in the bosom of God burns the original uncreated flame of love, of which all other love is the emanation and reflexion. And he knew that the norm of divinity is not man's all too prevalent inhumanity to his fellow-man, but man's nobility in those rare moments when he rises completely above himself into the atmosphere of another and a better world. The revelation probably astonished no one more than the prophet himself. Immediately he began to wonder if he had ever till then really known God at all. How blind and dull and stupid he had been! He had never realized what heights and depths of patient goodness there are in the Divine nature. He had never *sympathized* with Israel's God, whose holy love had been so long and so cruelly requited with ingratitude and infidelity. The new revelation, bursting upon his mind and opening his lips, made him a prophet. His gospel clothed itself in great words, which were not the fruit of the toiling intellect, but the gift of eternal love. And as for his own private sorrow, it was all but completely swallowed up in the joy of the apocalypse of Divine grace; so much so, that with another act of incredible daring, another intuition of childlike faith, he declares that even *that* marriage was, after all, made in heaven (Hos 1²).

Thus for the first time in history it dawned upon the human mind that God's sovereign attribute in heaven and in earth is His loving-kindness. The words almost tremble on the prophet's lips, though it was reserved for an apostle to utter them, that 'God is love.' Later seers and poets would express the truth in many other noble and beautiful forms, but there is a mingling of burning passion and melting pathos in Hosea's primitive Hebrew gospel—his protevangeliuim—which makes it for ever memorable:

How shall I give thee up, Ephraim?
 How shall I deliver thee, Israel?
 How shall I make thee as Admah?
 How shall I set thee as Zeboim?
 My heart is turned within me,
 All my sympathies are all aglow.
 I will not execute the fierceness of my anger,
 I will not turn to destroy Ephraim:
 For I am God, and not man.

For the first time it is seen that the real and fundamental difference between God and man is not His almightiness appalling our impotence, His greatness dwarfing our littleness, His omniscience amazing our ignorance, but His love shaming our lovelessness. That is the quintessence of Deity. By loving and redeeming where it was natural, as all the world thought, to loathe and reject, Hosea instinctively separated himself from men, took sides with God, and suddenly found himself caught up to a height from which he could see, as man had never seen before, that

Broad and deep and glorious,
 Like the heavens above,
 Shines in might victorious,
 God's eternal love.

At the same time, Hosea's experience enabled him to realize, like no one before him, the moral dilemma in the counsels of God, the acuteness of the conflict between the claims of justice and pity. To a mind like his, law without love, and love without law, were conceptions equally intolerable. And if, like our own great religious poet, he had sought refuge in the conclusion that 'all's love and all's law,' yet that would only have been a partial solution. The mind cannot rest except in a unity. There must be sovereignty and subordination in the attributes of God; and when Hosea's view of the universe, after many oscillations, at last adjusts itself, the crown is on the head of Love, before which Law bows as the most awful but most obedient of ministers.

There is a prevalent notion that men like Hosea, the Old Testament prophet of love, and John, the New Testament apostle of love, are soft emotionalists, with no iron in their blood, no rigour in their gospel. There could be no greater mistake. Hosea's passion for righteousness is even more vehement than that of Amos. As the spiritual physician of Israel, faithfully diagnosing her moral and social diseases, he does not hesitate to announce that desperate remedies are needed. He is not one to shrink from the use of the knife, or blanch at the sight of blood. It is no sentimentalist who utters the terrific words:

Shall I deliver them from the power of Sheol?
 Shall I redeem them from death?
 Hither with thy plagues, O death!
 Hither with thy pestilence, O Sheol!
 Repentance is hid from mine eyes.

But his last word can never be judgment or

death or destruction. He knows that God smites in order to save, cuts deep in order to heal (6¹). His distinctive and dominant conception—his inevitable word—is ‘love’ (*hesed*), which sums up both his religion and his ethics. ‘I drew them with human cords, with bands of love’ (13⁴). ‘It is love that I delight in, and not sacrifice’ (6⁶).

For how many thousands, or millions, of years had the living God been waiting for some mind to mirror and reveal His true nature to man! How patiently He had carried on ‘the education of the human race,’ always with this end in view, and always realizing that a lesson is never taught until it is learned! Hosea, with a heart purified and a mind illuminated by suffering, is the first to penetrate God’s open secret, that the deepest essence of Being is an inalienable love which cannot rest until it has redeemed the captive and saved the lost. Henceforth the Dweller in the Innermost, though unseen, will not be unknown.

It is not easy, therefore, to calculate our debt to Hosea. ‘When we consider,’ says Professor Cornill, ‘that all this was absolutely new, that those thoughts in which humanity has been educated and which have consoled it for 3000 years, were all first spoken by Hosea, we must reckon him among the greatest religious geniuses which the world has ever produced. . . . That this man, so apparently a man of emotion, governed entirely by his moods, and driven helplessly hither and thither by them, should have possessed a formal theological system, which has exercised an immeasurable influence on future generations, is a phenomenon of no slight significance. . . . But it is not too much to say that the entire faith and theology of later Israel grew out of Hosea, that all its characteristic views and ideas are to be first found in his book.’

Rapt into intense communion with God, till his eyes are opened to catch glimpses of eternal realities, and his ears to hear a music sweeter than

that of the spheres, the prophet reports his experience. And this is what the Revealer says in human speech: ‘I will not forsake, I will not destroy, I will love and redeem: for I am God, and not man.’ In the antithesis between God’s warm love and man’s cold indifference, therefore, lies all our hope of salvation. Another prophet heard a continuation of the strain: ‘For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts’ (Is 55^{8, 9}).

The Psalmist caught the rapture of it:

For as the heaven in its height
The earth surmounteth far,
So great to those who do him fear
His tender mercies are.

And finally the Christian poet gives the truth a perfect expression:

For the love of God is broader
Than the measures of man’s mind,
And the heart of the Eternal
Is most wonderfully kind.

Before the coming of Christ the world saw no more Christlike spirit than Hosea, and our Lord linked His own eternal gospel to that of the prophet of Ephraim by His favourite thrice-repeated quotation, ‘I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.’ All the grace that Hosea found in Israel’s God, that, and something more, we find in the ‘strong Son of God, immortal Love.’ The incarnation resolved the antithesis between the attributes and the actions of God and man. ‘I will not destroy: for I am God, and not man’—that was the gospel to Israel. ‘Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends’—that is the gospel given to all mankind by Him who ‘seemeth human and divine, the highest, holiest manhood’; who is not come to destroy, but to save, for He is God *and* man, in one person, for ever.

Contributions and Comments.

Note on Variant in the Text of John i. 13.

ALTHOUGH the MSS. authority supports the Textus receptus in reading $\alpha\iota$. . . $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, there are strong reasons for preferring $\delta\varsigma$. . . $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$. The latter was the text as known to Irenæus and Tertullian, and used by them against heretics as the undoubted original. There are unmistakable echoes of it, indeed, in Justin (see 'Ante-Nicene Library,' to which the subsequent references are made), *First Apology*, chaps. 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, pp. 25, 27, 35; and *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 63, p. 173. Irenæus quotes it three times. (1) In his treatise *Against Heresies* (Bk. iii. 16. 2, vol. i. p. 325) he writes: 'But the birth of Christ was on this wise,' and (Mt 1¹⁸) ' . . . Matthew might certainly have said, "Now the birth of *Jesus* was on this wise"; but the Holy Ghost, foreseeing the corrupters [of the truth], and guarding by anticipation against their deceit, says by Matthew, "But the birth of *Christ* was on this wise"; and that He is Emmanuel, lest perchance we might consider Him as a mere man: for "not by the will of the flesh, nor by the will of man, but by the will of God was the Word made flesh."' (2) In the same book (chap. 19. 2, p. 345), 'But he to whom the Father which is in heaven has revealed Him, knows Him, so that he understands that He "who was not born either by the will of the flesh, or by the will of man," is the Son of Man, This is the Christ, the Son of the living God.' (3) In Bk. v. chap. 1. 3, he writes (ii. p. 58), 'In the last times, not by the will of the flesh, nor by the will of man, but by the good pleasure of the Father, His hands formed a living man, etc.' In no one of these three quotations can Irenæus be taken as 'adapting' the words of Jn 1¹³. He uses the words as decisively proving that the Lord who became flesh was not 'a mere man,' 'But that He had, beyond all others, in Himself that pre-eminent birth which is from the Most High Father, and also experienced that pre-eminent generation which is from the Virgin, the divine Scriptures do in both respects testify of Him' (i. p. 345). His critical remarks on the text of Mt 1¹⁸ show he was careful of the exact text handed down; and indeed he is nothing if not conservative of 'tradition' through all his writings. It cannot be said that his

quotations have been taken from a Latin Version by his translator, for his argument demands the singular $\delta\varsigma$, as spoken of the Incarnate Word; and not the $\alpha\iota$, describing the regeneration of those who receive Him.

Tertullian is, if possible, even a more explicit witness to the $\delta\varsigma$. . . $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$. In his treatise 'On the flesh of Christ,' chap. 19 (vol. ii. p. 203), he writes: 'What then is the meaning of this passage, "Born (natus) not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God"? I will make more use of this passage after I have confuted those who have tampered with it. They maintain that it was written thus [in the plural] "*who were born*, etc.," as if designating those who were before mentioned as "believing in His name," in order to point out the existence of that mysterious seed of the elect and spiritual which they appropriate to themselves. But how can this be, when all who believe in the name of the Lord are, by reason of the common principle of the human race, born of blood, and of the will of the flesh, and of man, as indeed is Valentinus himself. The expression is in the singular number, as referring to the Lord, "He was born of God.'" On this Tertullian founds his argument (see also chaps. 15, 16, 18, 24, pp. 196, 199, 201, 213). Tertullian, though not ignorant of Greek, uses a Latin text. He was acquainted with a very early Latin version, which already 'in his time had become obsolete.' 'In usum exiit.' (Godet on John, Eng. trans., vol. i. p. 198 *note*.) Had this ancient version not agreed with the *Itala*, Tertullian could hardly have so boldly accused the heretics of corrupting the text. There is thus clear evidence for a very early text which had $\delta\varsigma$. . . $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$; a reading which must have been known to Irenæus in the Greek when a disciple of Polycarp in Smyrna, else he could not have used it as he did; and which, if accepted and handed on by Polycarp, is well attested. It is in the last degree improbable that Polycarp could have passed on to his disciple an inaccurate reading of his Master John on so momentous a passage of his Gospel;¹ or that Irenæus would have set

¹ A friend has drawn my attention to the following from Abbott and from Blass:—

'Irenæus and Tertullian must have read $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$ (natus est) for $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$; for both of them take the passage as

aside that which he learned of Polycarp for a Latin translation.

It is not necessary to suppose that the alteration was deliberately made, as Tertullian says. The emphatic *ῥοι*, with which the sentence begins, might very naturally suggest to a copyist that the *ῥς* should be *οἷ* . . . , and the verb be made plural also. This is far more likely than Westcott's suggestion that the singular was introduced in the Latin translation to agree with the preceding *αὐτοῦ*. Admittedly, the masculine *οἷ* creates a difficulty (Meyer and Godet, *in loco*). It has to be connected with the neuter *τέκνα*. But a more serious difficulty is met in the past tense, and the interpretation of the verse in accordance with it. How could it be said that to those who received Him—*i.e.* who believe on His name, was given 'right to become the children of God,' if they had been before 'born of God'? But the most serious objection to the received text has yet to be noted—that the use of the aorist *οἷ* . . . *ἐγεννήθησαν*, as applied to the regenerate, is contrary to the careful usage of St. John. He habitually uses the perfect tense in speaking of those *who have been* born of God, and *are*, therefore, His children; and as scrupulously uses the aorist in speaking of the eternally-begotten. In 1 Jn 5¹⁸ he writes: *Οἶδαμεν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει, ἀλλ' ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τηρεῖ αὐτόν* (cf. 3⁹ 4⁸ 5¹). Here *ὁ γεννηθεὶς* stand as a distinctive name. The aorist is used in Jn 3^{3. 5. 7} because our Lord is asserting that the definite experience of a birth from above must have taken place before one can see or enter the Kingdom of God; but in vv. 6. 8 John, as usual, writes in the perfect tense of those

describing the birth of Christ, and Tertullian accuses the Valentinians of altering the text so as to apply it to the above-mentioned "Credentes" instead of Christ' (Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 214, paragraph 2269a).

Blass, in his *Philology of the Gospels*, says: 'Among individual passages of contested readings there is none more deserving our attention than the thirteenth verse of the first chapter' [of John], and he gives his reasons for accepting the singular *ἐγεννήθη*, as supported by external and internal evidence, pp. 234-237. He would delete the pronoun *ὅς*; but the parallel of 1 Jn 5¹⁸ supports it.

The following also may be quoted from Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 278: '*Actus Petri c. Simone*, c. 24, ed. Lipsius, p. 72: *Alter propheta dicit, "Non de vulva mulieris natus, sed de coelesti loco descendit."* Lipsius bemerkt hiezu: "*Unde verba non de vulva . . . descendit sumta sint, nescio.*" Doch vgl. Joh. i. 13." These last words appear to imply that Resch accepts the reading *ὅς ἐγεννήθη*.

who having been born of the Spirit have the divine life.

One would certainly expect the perfect tense in Jn 1¹³ if the regenerate were meant. But there is no variant in the MSS. as to the tense, and the difficulty of the plural aorist cannot be explained away. It vanishes when we read the singular: 'As many as received him, to them he gave right to become children of God, even to them believing on the name of him who was born of God.' This construction accords with St. John's usage, cf. chaps. 3¹⁸ 20³¹, 1 Jn 3²³. In A.V. and R.V. one feels a lack of definition of 'the name,' as the effective source of regeneration to them that believe in it, which is at once supplied when it is read as 'The name of him who is the Begotten of God.' It is relevant, as a digression regarding the regenerate would not be; and is in perfect accord with Johannine and Pauline doctrine: That we become children of God by believing on the Name of His Son. But what could be more irrelevant than to turn aside to say of a *spiritual* birth that it was not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of a man—'man' being here used as synonymous with 'husband'? Those are not the terms which would be naturally used in speaking about a spiritual birth: it would have been enough to say it was 'of God.' The parenthesis becomes also at once intelligible. The explanations of its clauses, 'who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man,' as applied to the regenerate, are about as many as the commentators upon them: and often quite contradictory and obscure. As written of the Incarnate Son of God each is plain: 'He was not born of any of the races of mankind, nor by ordinary generation, nor had He an earthly father.' The latter clause is equivalent to Lk 1³⁴, and, as Tertullian says, cannot be true of any ordinary man. It is significant that the words *οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός* were, by the writer of Codex B, assigned to the margin, possibly because he felt the force of Tertullian's very obvious criticism. There can be no doubt that the reading *ὅς* was well known and widely accepted in the second century; that the singular aorist is in accordance with the usage of St. John, while the plural is not, as he always uses that tense of the only begotten, never of the regenerate—a usage perpetuated in the *γεννηθέντα* of the Nicene Creed; and that the cumulative value of the

three clauses in the parenthesis becomes at once manifest when understood as written of Him whom no one of all the races of man can claim, who was not born by ordinary generation, and to whom no man was father; but in whom all, who by faith receive Him as the only begotten (ver. 18), find themselves to be the children of God.

There is ground enough, surely, to recognize this very early text as entitled at least to a place in the margin of any new 'Revised Version.'

Crieff.

ARCH. HENDERSON.

'Sirs, ye are Brethren.'

Is this the correct translation of Ac 7²⁶? I know of no writer who has thought of changing it.

And yet, it seems, we must remove the comma after *ἄνδρες* and translate 'Ye are brethren,' literally 'Men brethren are ye.' Compare the constant use of *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* in Acts from 1¹⁶ 2²⁹ onward; especially in our passage the reading of Codex D: *τί ποιεῖτε, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί; ἵνα τί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους*; but, above all, the parallel passage from the Old Testament, which appears to be at the background of our passage, Gn 13⁸, *אֲנִי וְאַחֵי אִשְׁמֵן*, *ἄνθρωποι ἀδελφοὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν*, we are brethren, literally 'men brethren.' Even H. J. White, in the new *editio minor* of the Latin N.T., prints *Viri, fratres estis*, where the larger edition had given *Viri fratres* without comma, 'Ye are brotherly men.'

E. B. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Joseph Woodhouse, Lindfield, New South Wales.

Illustrations of the Great Text for September must be received by the 1st of August. The text is 1 Co 4⁵.

The Great Text for October is 1 Co 15⁵⁸—'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts' or of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for November is Ro 15¹³—'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.' A copy of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or of Lewis's *Philocalia of Origen*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for December is Jn 6³⁵—'Jesus

said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' A copy of Welch's *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*, or of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Gem's *An Anglo-Saxon Abbot*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for January is 2 Ch 6⁸—'But the Lord said unto David my father, Whereas it was in thine heart to build an house for my name, thou didst well that it was in thine heart.' A copy of Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.